

Science of the Total Environment

USE OF A WASTEWATER RECOVERY PRODUCT (STRUVITE) TO ENHANCE SUBTROPICAL SEAGRASS RESTORATION

--Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	STOTEN-D-22-01603R1
Article Type:	Research Paper
Section/Category:	
Keywords:	Halodule wrightii; Seagrass; Marine restoration; Fertilizer; struvite; Phosphorus
Corresponding Author:	Conor MacDonnell Gainesville, FL UNITED STATES
First Author:	Conor MacDonnell, PhD
Order of Authors:	Conor MacDonnell, PhD Franciszek Bydalek, MS Todd Osborne, PhD Anna Beard, BS Sophia Barbour, MA Devin Leonard, BS Jacek Makinia, PhD Patrick Inglett, PhD
Abstract:	<p>Seagrasses are in decline worldwide, and their restoration is relatively expensive and unsuccessful compared to other coastal systems. Fertilization can improve seagrass growth in restoration but can also release nutrients and pollute the surrounding ecosystem. A slow-release fertilizer may reduce excessive nutrient discharge while still providing resources to the seagrass's rhizosphere. In this study, struvite (magnesium ammonium phosphate), a relatively insoluble, sustainable compound harvested in wastewater treatment plants, was compared to Osmocote™ (14:14:14 Nitrogen: Phosphorus: Potassium, N:P:K), a popular polymer coated controlled release fertilizer commonly used in seagrass restoration. Two experiments compared the effectiveness of both fertilizers in a subtropical flow-through mesocosm setup. In the first experiment, single 0.5 mg of P per g dry weight (DW) doses of Osmocote™ and struvite fertilizers were added to seagrass plots. Seagrass shoot counts were significantly higher in plots fertilized with struvite than both the Osmocote™ and unfertilized controls ($p < 0.0001$). A significant difference in total P concentrations was observed in porewater samples of Osmocote™ vs struvite and controls ($p < 0.0001$), with struvite fertilized plots emitting more than controls ($p < 0.0001$), but less than 2% of the total dissolved P (TDP) of Osmocote™ fertilized plots (100+ mg/L versus $x > 5$ mg/L). A subsequent experiment, using smaller doses (0.01 and 0.025 mg of P per gram DW added), also found that the struvite treatments performed better than Osmocote™, with 16-114% more aboveground biomass (10-60% higher total biomass) while releasing less N and P. These results indicate the relatively rapid dissolution of Osmocote™ may pose problems to restoration efforts, especially in concentrated doses and possibly leading to seagrass stress. In contrast, struvite may function as a slow-release fertilizer applicable in seagrass and other coastal restoration efforts.</p>
Response to Reviewers:	<p>Reviewer 1 Page 1, Paragraph 1, Line 11 (Abstract): In the first experiment, single 0.5 mg of P per g DW doses of Osmocote™ and struvite fertilizers - What do you mean by single 0.5... and spell out DW. Changed to "dry weight (DW)," 0.5 mg of P per g DW means that for every gram of sediment 0.5 mg of P was added via fertilizer. Page 6, Paragraph 15, Line 130: spell out PCF. Done. Page 6, Paragraph 15, Lines 128-132: Please explain your decision of 60 and 70-day experiment. Added "the length of each experiment was based on typical H. wrightii</p>

transplantation recovery times combined with time limitations on the use of the mesocosms at the marine lab.”

Tables: show only ANOVA results but you omitted given the actual data. The data is depicted either via figures or the supplementary tables (i.e. TDN/TDP, tissue and sediment TN/TC from the second experiment).

Figures 1A and 3: Box plots with median and interquartile range + whiskers lines are much better than histograms. While we agree that the interquartile range and median may add value to the figures, we are concerned that visualizing the scale and significances (letters) between the treatments and dates would be negatively affected.

Page 18, Paragraph 46, Lines 392-409: Repeat of the results, not a real discussion here. The introduction of the discussion section contains a summary of the results using percentages extrapolated from the figures/data. While repeating the general conclusion of the results, we believe it is not actually repeating the results section (the numbers listed are not present anywhere else in the manuscript) and is a valuable tool in creating a compelling transition between the results and discussion.

Pages 18-19, Paragraph 47, Lines 414 to 434: Fair amount of speculations regarding the $\text{NO}_3 + \text{NH}_4$ impact on the roots of seagrass. Some measurements would have helped to support your interpretation. We observed severely stunted roots and excessive nitrogen release in the Osmocote treated plots ($x > 100\text{mg/L}$) in the first experiment, with photographic evidence of the possible root burn that will be add to the supplementary material. In the second experiment we drastically reduced fertilizer concentrations and did not observe notable root damage. While not conclusive, the evidence heavily indicates that nitrogen had a severely negative effect on the belowground biomass of the plants.

Page 20, Paragraph 47, Lines 438-: Why did you put the N:P data in the SI? In any event the N:P ratio index is not always conclusive enough to tell the story. Agreed. The N:P ratio, especially for porewater, was not meant to be conclusive given the limitations of the data. Therefore, after consulting with the co-authors, we've decided to remove the paragraph detailing porewater ratios (lines 462-470). The paragraph detailing tissue concentrations will remain as an indicator of nutrient limitation instead of a conclusive story. We took the measurements to provide insight toward the success of the struvite treatment, and we hope the data can provide at least good discussion toward the differences in performance between struvite and Osmocote.

Page 21, Paragraph 50, Lines 462-470: Show all these results in a figure. Addressed above.

Figure 4: Very nice data analysis but please spell out the title of the axis and their statistical meaning. A more detailed graph/caption has been produced.

However, too often researchers making a huge theoretical leap to the real world where conditions are not in favor of their mesocosms results. The authors touched on this point rather lightly by acknowledging the fact the sea currents, redox potential and other factors may obliterate the advantage of struvite over commercial fertilizer. I would have support the publication of this manuscript if the authors were able to show that their findings are applicable in a real world conditions. Added two new paragraphs within a new section “Field Applications of the Study” addressing the applicability of the mesocosm study to field conditions.

Reviewer 3

Page 1, Paragraph 1, Line 9: or N-P2O5-K2O? Yes, however the composition is referred to as 14:14:14 NPK.

Page 1, Paragraph 1, Line 17: TDP??? Total dissolved phosphorus, added the unabbreviated name.

Page 2, Paragraph 2, Line 28: Very long introduction, please abbreviate. We shortened the introduction by approximately 20%.

Page 6, Paragraph 15, Line 130: What Is that? PCF means polymer coated fertilizer, added the unabbreviated name.

Page 6, Paragraph 16, Lines 134 and 136: Did you equilibrate the amounts of NPK for both sources? If not, how can you explain the results comparing both? We agree that equilibrating for nitrogen could provide valuable insights into the effects of the fertilizer, perhaps with implications for N limited systems. However, we were time and resource (including mesocosm space) limited. We prioritized/equilibrated for P as the key element in a P limited system, however future studies could also equilibrate for N for additional details/insights.

Page 7, Paragraph 17, Line 147: How do you know that is P2O5???? Did you analyze that? If not, please refer to the true composition that should be P linked to Ca or NH_3 ,



but P2O5 for sure.... We did not analyze the composition of Osmocote, however, Osmocote has an ingredients list stating that its fertilizer is composed of P as P2O5. P2O5 is the standardized terminology for P in traditional fertilizers (Tisdale, Page 9, Paragraph 22, Lines 201, 206: Blank, don't know how to respond. Page 11, Paragraph 27, Line 233: What is this unit? Please specify. Parts per thousand, added the unabbreviated name.

Page 13, Paragraph 33, Line 277: this part of the results is too much a description of the numbers, if the numbers are presented in a table there is not neccisity to describe in details. Also, should be focused on the main results for a more brief/comprehensive manuscript. Agreed, the results section for the second experiment has been re-arranged and reduced by approximately 35% to improve readability and comprehensiveness.

Page 13, Paragraph 33, Lines 285-6: What is that? Sampling dates, removed for clarity.

Page 18, Paragraph 45, Line 403: are you comparing struvite with struvite??? I did not get this??? We meant comparisons of struvite to equivalent Osmocote fertilizer dosages. However, the sentence was confusing, we have re-arranged the sentence and corrected a couple numbers to represent average shoot count/length at the end of the experiment.

Page 18, Paragraph 46, Line 411: Did you equilibrate the dose of N via struvite and Osmocote? If not, how can you compare both? Because the amount applied was very distinct to each other. In a marine coastal environment, typically P is limiting, therefore P was equilibrated. In a P limited environment, excess N would only exacerbate the limitation. N could have negative consequences in high doses as was possibly the case in experiment 1 but the lower doses in experiment 2 showed no significant negative effects associated with N exposure (as doses were significantly lower). In a future study it may be valuable to equilibrate N but in an applied study of fertilizers in a P limited environment a difference in N could not be avoided.

Submission date: 1/11/22

Professor Damià Barceló
Co-Editor in Chief
Science of the Total Environment

Dear Professor Damià Barceló,

We are pleased to submit our manuscript entitled: “Use of wastewater recovery product (struvite) to enhance subtropical seagrass restoration”, for consideration as an original research paper. This study consists of two comparative mesocosm experiments testing the effectiveness of *in situ* mineral fertilization on seagrass restoration. Seagrass is one of the most ecologically valuable marine ecosystems, providing estimated \$29,000 ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹ in ecosystems services. Yet, despite its value, seagrass beds are declining worldwide in alarming rate.

In situ fertilizer application is a commonly applied seagrass restoration technique, characterized with high rates of success. However, the key drawback of the process is the use of unsustainable fertilizers such as phosphate rock or commercially manufactured controlled release NPK fertilizers. Such an approach can largely offset potential ecological benefits of successful restoration projects. Therefore, we propose the use of a wastewater recovery product, struvite, as an alternative to manufactured commercial fertilizers. Struvite is a widely recognized and applied slow release fertilizer obtained during the wastewater treatment process. Use of struvite introduces elements of sustainability and circular economy in seagrass restoration efforts. In our study, we compared the effects of a popular polymer coated fertilizer (Osmocote) commonly used in seagrass restoration with struvite on seagrass growth and porewater nutrient release. The experiments found that struvite at equivalent doses to Osmocote produced significantly higher seagrass metrics (shoot count and biomass) while emitting significantly fewer nutrients (total dissolved nitrogen and phosphorus). These results demonstrate the potential effectiveness of struvite in seagrass restoration and the relatively rapid dissolution of Osmocote, a potential issue for restoration efforts/local water quality. These findings may be important to providing an effective but low nutrient emission fertilizer for applications in coastal restoration. Within the aims and scope of the Science of the Total Environment, the results of this study are relevant to the subjects of stress ecology in marine ecosystems (or attempts to reduce stress in a sensitive ecosystem) and water quality. This study applies a novel compound in a semi-controlled environment that interconnects with multiple spheres (including the hydrosphere, biosphere, and lithosphere).

This manuscript has not been previously published and is not under consideration in the same or substantially similar form in any other peer-reviewed media. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Dr. Conor MacDonnell

Corresponding author:

Dr. Conor MacDonnell
University of Florida
2306 Mowry Road, Bldg. 164, Gainesville, FL 32611
cpmacdonnell@ufl.edu
+1 434-202-9337

Reserve contact

Professor Patrick Inglett
University of Florida
2181 McCarty Hall A PO Box 110290, Gainesville, FL 32611
pinglett@ufl.edu
+1 352-294-3170

Potential reviewers

Name : Dr. Tjisse Van Der Heide
Affiliation : University of Groningen
Address : PO Box 59, 1790 AB Den Burg (Texel), the Netherlands
Email : tjisse.van.der.heide@nioz.nl
Phone : +31 (0)222-369-511

Name : Dr. Marieke M. van Katwijk
Affiliation : Radboud University
Address : Heyendaalseweg 135, 6525 AJ Nijmegen, the Netherlands
Email : m.vankatwijk@science.ru.nl

Name : Prof. James Fourqurean
Affiliation : Florida International University
Address : 11200 SW 8th St, OE 148, Miami, FL, 33199, USA
Email : fourqure@fiu.edu
Phone : +1 305-348-4084

Name : Dr. Amanda Bourque
Affiliation : National Park Service
Address : 9700 SW 328th St, Sir Lancelot Jones Way, Homestead, FL 33033, USA
Email : amanda_bourque@nps.gov
Phone : +1 786-335-3626

Name : Prof. Miller Alonso Camargo-Valero
Affiliation : University of Leeds
Address : School of Civil Engineering, University of Leeds, Leeds, LS2 9JT, UK
Email : M.A.Camargo-Valero@leeds.ac.uk
Phone : +44(0)113 343 1580

Name : Prof. Robert J. Orth
Affiliation : Virginia Institute of Marine Science (retired)
Address : 1370 Greate Rd, Gloucester Point, VA, 23062, USA
Email : jjorth@vims.edu



Phone : +1 804-684-7392

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

USE OF A WASTEWATER RECOVERY PRODUCT (STRUVITE) TO ENHANCE SUBTROPICAL SEAGRASS RESTORATION

Authors: MacDonnell, C.^{a,1}, Bydalek, F.^{b,2}, Osborne, T.Z.^c, Beard, A.^c, Barbour, S.^a,
Leonard, D.^a, Makinia, J.^b and Inglett, P.W.^a

Affiliations: a: University of Florida, Soil and Water Sciences Department, 1692
McCarty Drive, Gainesville, FL 32603

b: Department of Sanitary Engineering, Gdańsk University of Technology, 80-233
Gdansk, Poland

c: Whitney Laboratory for Biosciences, 9505 N Ocean Shore Blvd, St. Augustine, FL
32080

Corresponding Author:

Inglett, P.W., pinglett@ufl.edu

¹ Current address: University of Florida, 2306 Mowry Road, Bldg. 164, Gainesville, FL 32611

² Current address: Department of Chemical Engineering, Water Innovation & Research Centre (WIRC),
University of Bath, Claverton Down, Bath BA2 7AY, United Kingdom

Response to Reviewers

Reviewer 1

Page 1, Paragraph 1, Line 11 (Abstract): In the first experiment, single 0.5 mg of P per g DW doses of OsmocoteTM and struvite fertilizers - What do you mean by single 0.5... and spell out DW. **Changed to “dry weight (DW),” 0.5 mg of P per g DW means that for every gram of sediment 0.5 mg of P was added via fertilizer.**

Page 6, Paragraph 15, Line 130: spell out PCF. **Done.**

Page 6, Paragraph 15, Lines 128-132: Please explain your decision of 60 and 70-day experiment. **Added “the length of each experiment was based on typical *H. wrightii* transplantation recovery times combined with time limitations on the use of the mesocosms at the marine lab.”**

Tables: show only ANOVA results but you omitted given the actual data. **The data is depicted either via figures or the supplementary tables (i.e. TDN/TDP, tissue and sediment TN/TC from the second experiment).**

Figures 1A and 3: Box plots with median and interquartile range + whiskers lines are much better than histograms. **While we agree that the interquartile range and median may add value to the figures, we are concerned that visualizing the scale and significances (letters) between the treatments and dates would be negatively affected.**

Page 18, Paragraph 46, Lines 392-409: Repeat of the results, not a real discussion here. **The introduction of the discussion section contains a summary of the results using percentages extrapolated from the figures/data. While repeating the general conclusion of the results, we believe it is not actually repeating the results section (the numbers listed are not present anywhere else in the manuscript) and is a valuable tool in creating a compelling transition between the results and discussion.**

Pages 18-19, Paragraph 47, Lines 414 to 434: Fair amount of speculations regarding the $\text{NO}_3 + \text{NH}_4$ impact on the roots of seagrass. Some measurements would have helped to support your interpretation. **We observed severely stunted roots and excessive nitrogen release in the Osmocote treated plots ($x > 100 \text{ mg/L}$) in the first experiment, with photographic evidence of the possible root burn that will be add to the supplementary material. In the second experiment we drastically reduced fertilizer concentrations and did not observe notable root damage. While not conclusive, the evidence heavily indicates that nitrogen had a severely negative effect on the belowground biomass of the plants.**

Page 20, Paragraph 47, Lines 438-: Why did you put the N:P data in the SI? In any event the N:P ratio index is not always conclusive enough to tell the story. **Agreed. The N:P ratio, especially for porewater, was not meant to be conclusive given the limitations of the data. Therefore, after consulting with the co-authors, we’ve decided to remove the paragraph detailing porewater ratios (lines 462-470). The paragraph detailing tissue concentrations will remain as an indicator of nutrient limitation instead of a conclusive story. We took the measurements to provide insight toward the success of the struvite treatment, and we hope the data can provide at least good discussion toward the differences in performance between struvite and Osmocote.**

Page 21, Paragraph 50, Lines 462-470: Show all these results in a figure. **Addressed above.**

Figure 4: Very nice data analysis but please spell out the title of the axis and their statistical meaning. **A more detailed graph/caption has been produced.**

However, too often researchers making a huge theoretical leap to the real world where conditions are not in favor of their mesocosms results. The authors touched on this point rather lightly by acknowledging the fact the sea currents, redox potential and other factors may obliterate the advantage of struvite over commercial fertilizer. I would have support the publication of this manuscript if the authors were able to show that their findings are applicable in a real world conditions. **Added two new paragraphs within a new section "Field Applications of the Study" addressing the applicability of the mesocosm study to field conditions.**

Reviewer 3

Page 1, Paragraph 1, Line 9: or N-P2O5-K2O? **Yes, however the composition is referred to as 14:14:14 NPK.**

Page 1, Paragraph 1, Line 17: TDP??? **Total dissolved phosphorus, added the unabbreviated name.**

Page 2, Paragraph 2, Line 28: Very long introduction, please abbreviate. **We shortened the introduction by approximately 20%.**

Page 6, Paragraph 15, Line 130: What Is that? **PCF means polymer coated fertilizer, added the unabbreviated name.**

Page 6, Paragraph 16, Lines 134 and 136: Did you equilibrate the amounts of NPK for both sources? If not, how can you explain the results comparing both? **We agree that equilibrating for nitrogen could provide valuable insights into the effects of the fertilizer, perhaps with implications for N limited systems. However, we were time and resource (including mesocosm space) limited. We prioritized/equilibrated for P as the key element in a P limited system, however future studies could also equilibrate for N for additional details/insights.**

Page 7, Paragraph 17, Line 147: How do you know that is P2O5???? Did you analyze that? If not, please refer to the true composition that should be P linked to Ca or NH₃, but P2O₅ for sure.... **We did not analyze the composition of Osmocote, however, Osmocote has an ingredients list stating that its fertilizer is composed of P as P2O5. P2O5 is the standardized terminology for P in traditional fertilizers (Tisdale,**

Page 9, Paragraph 22, Lines 201, 206: Blank, don't know how to respond.

Page 11, Paragraph 27, Line 233: What is this unit? Please specify. **Parts per thousand, added the unabbreviated name.**

Page 13, Paragraph 33, Line 277: this part of the results is too much a description of the numbers, if the numbers are presented in a table there is not necessity to describe in details. Also, should be focused on the main results for a more brief/comprehensive manuscript. **Agreed, the results section for the second experiment has been re-arranged and reduced by approximately 35% to improve readability and comprehensiveness.**

Page 13, Paragraph 33, Lines 285-6: What is that? **Sampling dates, removed for clarity.**

Page 18, Paragraph 45, Line 403: are you comparing struvite with struvite??? I did not get this??? **We meant comparisons of struvite to equivalent Osmocote fertilizer dosages. However, the sentence was confusing, we have re-arranged the sentence and corrected a couple numbers to represent average shoot count/length at the end of the experiment.**

Page 18, Paragraph 46, Line 411: Did you equilibrate the dose of N via struvite and Osmocote? If not, how can you compare both? Because the amount applied was very distinct to each other. **In a marine coastal environment, typically P is limiting, therefore P was equilibrated. In a P limited environment, excess N would only exacerbate the limitation. N could have negative consequences in high doses as was possibly the case in experiment 1 but the lower doses in experiment 2 showed no significant negative effects associated with N exposure (as doses were significantly lower). In a future study it may be valuable to equilibrate N but in an applied study of fertilizers in a P limited environment a difference in N could not be avoided.**

Other edits

Title Page

T. Osborne changed to T.Z. Osborne.

P. Inglett added as corresponding author.

Manuscript:

Figure 2: Adjusted color scheme of 2B to match 2A.

Tables: Moved all tables to supplementary material, added two tables for sediment nutrients/significant differences.

Mesocosm conditions: Moved from the results section to methods (site description) for greater clarity of environmental conditions.

1 Abstract

2 Seagrasses are in decline worldwide, and their restoration is relatively expensive and
3 unsuccessful compared to other coastal systems. Fertilization can improve seagrass
4 growth in restoration but can also ~~excessively~~ release nutrients and pollute the
5 surrounding ecosystem. A slow-~~release~~ fertilizer may reduce excessive nutrient
6 discharge while still providing resources to the seagrass's rhizosphere. In this study,
7 struvite (magnesium ammonium phosphate), a relatively insoluble ~~fertilizer sustainably,~~
8 sustainable compound harvested in wastewater treatment plants, was compared to
9 Osmocote™ (14:14:14 ~~NPK~~Nitrogen: Phosphorus: Potassium, N:P:K), a popular
10 polymer coated controlled release fertilizer commonly used in seagrass restoration. Two
11 experiments compared the effectiveness of both fertilizers in a subtropical flow-through
12 mesocosm setup. In the first experiment, single 0.5 mg of P per g dry weight (DW)
13 doses of Osmocote™ and struvite fertilizers were added to seagrass plots ~~inside a six~~
14 ~~meter diameter flow-through mesocosm~~. Seagrass shoot counts were significantly
15 higher in plots fertilized with struvite than both the Osmocote™ and unfertilized controls
16 ($p < 0.0001$). A significant difference in total phosphorusP concentrations was observed
17 in porewater samples of Osmocote™ vs struvite and controls ($p < 0.0001$), with struvite
18 fertilized plots emitting more than controls ($p \leq 0.0001$), but less than 2% of the total
19 dissolved P (TDP) of Osmocote™ fertilized plots (100+ mg/L versus $x > 5$ mg/L).- A
20 subsequent experiment, using smaller doses (0.01 and 0.025 mg of P per gram DW
21 added), also found that the struvite treatments performed better than Osmocote™, with
22 16-114% more aboveground biomass (10-60% higher total biomass) while releasing
23 less nitrogenN and phosphorusP. These results indicate the relatively rapid dissolution

24 of Osmocote™ may pose problems to restoration efforts, especially in concentrated
25 doses and possibly leading to seagrass stress. In contrast, struvite may function as a
26 slow-release fertilizer applicable in seagrass and other coastal restoration efforts.

27 **Keywords:** *Halodule wrightii*; seagrass; marine restoration; fertilizer; struvite;
28 Osmocote™; phosphorus

29 1. **4-Introduction**

30 In many environments, restoration ~~can be is~~ improved by fertilization, lessening
31 nutrient limitations and improving growth of desired species (Armitage et al., 2011;
32 Balestri & Lardicci, 2014; Fereidooni et al., 2013; Holmes, 2001; Jaquetti et al., 2014;
33 Reed et al., 2007). ~~For example, Jaquetti et al. (2014) found that fertilization more than~~
34 ~~doubled the absolute growth rate and significantly improved the photosynthetic~~
35 ~~response of trees applied in a degraded rainforest restoration site.~~ However, in some
36 environments, fertilizers can have a negative effect on species diversity and in extreme
37 cases may even pollute the surrounding environment (Fonseca et al., 1998; Hill & Heck,
38 2015; Zedler, 2000). ~~For example, nitrogen fertilization often contributes to coastal~~
39 ~~hypoxia and nitrous oxide emissions (Robertson & Vitousek, 2009). Therefore,~~
40 ~~consideration of the ecosystem, nutrient needs, and type of fertilizer is important to~~
41 ~~maximizing the benefits of fertilization approaches while minimizing the environmental~~
42 ~~impact of fertilizer use. Therefore, consideration of the ecosystem, nutrient needs, and~~
43 ~~type of fertilizer is important to maximizing the benefits of fertilization approaches while~~
44 ~~minimizing the environmental impact of fertilizer use.~~

45 ~~Balancing the positive and negative~~The ramifications of fertilizer use ~~is are~~
46 especially relevant in coastal seagrass ~~ecosystem restoration. Seagrass ecosystems~~
47 ~~are systems, which are both~~ important ~~coastal ecosystemshabitats and currently~~ facing

Formatted: Outline numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering
Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned
at: 0" + Indent at: 0.25"



48 global declines due to ~~direct~~ human disturbance and climate change (Bayraktarov et al.,
49 2016). Seagrasses are a comparatively difficult and expensive coastal ecosystem to
50 restore, partially due to eutrophication, competition from algae and other nutrient related
51 issues (ibid). However, fertilizers have been consistently found to improve seagrass
52 health and restoration success (~~Armitage et al., 2011; Kenworthy et al., 2018~~)(Armitage
53 et al., 2011; Kenworthy et al., 2018). ~~Therefore, it is critical to provide a fertilizer that~~
54 ~~directs nutrients toward seagrass growth and minimizes the release of nutrients to the~~
55 ~~surrounding environment.~~

56 Traditionally, both the direct application of controlled release fertilizers (Armitage
57 & Fourqurean, 2016; Fonseca et al., 1998; Peralta et al., 2003; Sheridan et al., 1998)
58 and the deployment of bird roosting stakes (Fonseca et al., 1994; Furman et al., 2019)
59 have positive effects on seagrass ~~above and belowground biomass in multiple systems.~~
60 Ecosystem, and can accelerate ecosystem succession for seagrass ~~also appears to be~~
61 ~~accelerated by the addition of nutrients in the short and long term~~ (Bourque &
62 Fourqurean, 2014; Armitage et al., 2011). However, the use of traditional fertilization
63 techniques in seagrass restoration may result in variable levels of nutrients or over-
64 fertilization (~~Fonseca et al., 1998; Kenworthy et al., 2018~~)(Fonseca et al., 1998;
65 Kenworthy et al., 2018), with consequences for the succession of seagrass species
66 (ibid).

67 One of the main issues with fertilization in aquatic seagrass systems is ~~the~~
68 ~~difficulty~~ that immersion and hydrodynamics can lead to rapid dissolution of fertilizers,
69 increasing short term nutrient availability to the desired plant species, but at the
70 expense of nutrient loss, ecosystem disruption, and pollution (Fonseca et al., 1998; Hill

71 & Heck, 2015; Olsen & Valiela, 2010). For example, Hall et al. (2006) had to replace
72 buried fertilizer pellets every three to four months in a macrophyte restoration effort,
73 while Herbert and Fourqurean (2008) found that bird ~~stake fertilization~~stakes (bird
74 roosting structures that promote feces accumulation, Fonseca et al., 1994; Furman et
75 al., 2019) can overfertilize seagrass ~~restoration~~ sites, disrupting succession and
76 increasing epiphytic biomass. These drawbacks are due either to the fertilizers being
77 adapted for terrestrial applications, releasing nutrients too rapidly after flushing with
78 water, or in the case of bird stakes, due to variable rates of feces deposition combined
79 with diffusion of nutrients in the water during precipitation and settling (Hill & Heck,
80 2015). Applying multiple doses of traditional mineral fertilizers ~~incurs a significant~~
81 ~~financial and labor cost~~ (Ferdie & Fourqurean, 2004; Hall et al., 2006; Olsen & Valiela,
82 2010). ~~Similarly, the or monitoring~~ bird stake ~~approach requires extra labor to~~
83 ~~monitor~~treated beds for symptoms of excess fertilization ~~and remove the stakes after~~
84 ~~about 18 months (Kenworthy et al., 2018). Thus, a slower dissolving fertilizer resistant~~
85 ~~to leaching may reduce overfertilization with less labor inputs while still providing~~
86 ~~benefits toward seagrass growth and survival. (Kenworthy et al., 2018) also incurs a~~
87 significant financial and labor cost. Thus, a slower dissolving fertilizer that resists
88 leaching may reduce overfertilization and labor expenses while still providing benefits
89 toward seagrass growth and survival.

90 Struvite (magnesium ammonium phosphate, or $MgNH_4PO_4 \cdot 6H_2O$) is a by-
91 product of wastewater treatment that is harvested in separated, side-stream sludge
92 management processes (Ghosh et al., 2019). ~~Struvite forms when equal molar ratios of~~
93 ~~Mg^{2+} , NH_4^+ , PO_4^{3-} occur in the solution, thus the feeding sources are typically nutrient-~~





94 ~~rich sludge dewatering liquors or digestate often dosed with an external source of~~
95 ~~magnesium (Kumar & Pal, 2015; Martí et al., 2010).~~ Struvite is poorly soluble in water,
96 but releases P more rapidly in the presence of organic acids exuded from roots, making
97 it a potentially ideal fertilizer for direct plant uptake (Cabeza et al., 2011; Robles-Aguilar
98 et al., 2019). Past studies have supported both high performance of struvite for
99 terrestrial plant applications as well as its resistance to flushing (Lee et al., 2009;
100 Rahman et al., 2014). ~~Struvite application for restoration purposes would also support a~~
101 ~~more sustainable wastewater management through the increased use of recovered~~
102 ~~resources (Mayer et al., 2016) and introduced restoration activities into a circular~~
103 ~~economy.~~

104 While the utilization of struvite in aquatic systems appears very promising, to
105 date there is an absence of studies investigating this fertilizer in marine restoration
106 projects, especially in combination with other fertilization techniques. While it has been
107 demonstrated that struvite is poorly soluble fertilizer except when exposed to acidic
108 conditions (Cabeza et al., 2011; Talboys et al., 2016), experiments determining the
109 availability of struvite to submerged aquatic vegetation do not currently exist. Thus, the
110 goals of this study were to 1) assess potential differences in seagrass performance (~~e.g.~~
111 ~~metrics like~~ shoot count, growth, length, and biomass as defined by Arrington, 2008,
112 Herbeck et al., 2014, Rezek et al., 2019, Short & Coles, 2001, and Thomsen et al.,
113 2012, ~~among others~~) after addition of struvite versus a polymer coated, 'slow
114 ~~release~~' controlled release fertilizer (PCF, Osmocote™) commonly used in seagrass
115 restoration, and 2) to determine shifts in sediment and porewater nutrients caused by
116 the introduction of the fertilizers in plots with and without seagrass. We hypothesized



117 that seagrass in plots fertilized with struvite would have increased performance
118 compared to plots fertilized with Osmocote™, and that struvite would be dissolved at a
119 slower rate than Osmocote™ (~~determined by measuring based on~~ porewater total
120 dissolved nutrients).

121 **2. 2- Materials and Methods**

122 **2.1.2-1 Site Description and Design**

123 To minimize the variability found in field experiments and more accurately
124 investigate nutrient levels related to fertilization, a mesocosm experiment was
125 conducted at the Whitney Laboratory of Marine Biosciences in St. Augustine, FL.
126 Seawater (filtered through a shelly sand and activated charcoal biofilter) pumped from
127 offshore entered a 6.5 m diameter mesocosm (approximately 1 m deep), to emulate the
128 natural environment. Water flow was constant into the mesocosm. Experiments were
129 based on the methods explained in the propagation guide for *Halodule wrightii*,
130 ~~prepared by the University of Southern Mississippi~~ (Biber et al., 2013). Seagrass was
131 collected directly from donor sites off St. Martins Marsh Aquatic Preserve, FL. Shoots
132 were removed from the donor sediment and maintained in cool conditions until they
133 were transplanted into plastic pot containers (10 cm depth), buried in approximately 5
134 cm of coarse, shell-dominated sand taken from the local St. Augustine area (rinsed to
135 reduce organics and residual nutrients). The sediment used ~~comprised at least 99%~~
136 ~~sand with had~~ a mean grain size of 706 microns (not including particles greater than 2
137 mm).

138 **2.1.1 Mesocosm Conditions**

139 ~~2.2- Mesocosm temperature and salinity remained between 27-31 °C and 33-38~~
140 ~~parts per thousand respectively during the periods sampled (between 9 am and 3 pm)~~

Formatted: Outline numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0" + Indent at: 0.25"

Formatted: Outline numbered + Level: 2 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0" + Indent at: 0.3"

Formatted: Outline numbered + Level: 3 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0" + Indent at: 0.5"

141 for both studies. The hydraulic residence time was variable at 0.5-2 days, due to a
142 limited saltwater supply. The mean TDN of surface water was 0.44 ± 0.06 mg N L⁻¹,
143 while the mean TDP was 0.035 ± 0.001 mg P L⁻¹ (or 0.029 mg P L⁻¹ when excluding a
144 day of low inflow). The level of flow was great enough to prevent significant cross
145 contamination of the plots studied, as well as prevent significant swings in temperature
146 and salinity that could stress the plants.

147 **2.2. Experiments**

148 Two separate experiments were conducted in the summer and fall of 2018. The
149 first 60-day experiment consisted of six different treatment options, including bare sand
150 with or without fertilizers (terrestrial **PCF polymer coated fertilizer** or struvite) and
151 seagrass with or without fertilizers. A second 70-day experiment was conducted
152 consisting of multiple lower doses of both fertilizers.

153 **2.2.1. 2.2.1 Single Dose/First Experiment**

154 For the **PCF polymer coated** controlled release fertilizer treatment, Osmocote™
155 14:14:14 NPK (Scotts Miracle-Gro Company, Marysville, OH, USA) was chosen due to
156 its commercial availability, composition (containing both N and P), and past use in
157 seagrass restoration experiments (Peralta et al., 2003; Sheridan et al., 1998; Tanner &
158 Parham, 2010). Struvite used in the experiment was produced in a pilot scale fluidized
159 bed reactor fed with sludge dewatering liquor. Detailed morphological and elemental
160 characteristics are described elsewhere (Bydalek et al., 2018). Unlike the mostly
161 homogenous struvite, each Osmocote™ prill has a porous outer layer that gradually
162 releases a contained water-soluble nutrient dose through diffusion. The composition of
163 elements is also different between the two compounds; with NH₄⁺/NO₃⁻-N comprising

Formatted: Outline numbered + Level: 2 + Numbering
Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned
at: 0" + Indent at: 0.3"

Formatted: Outline numbered + Level: 3 + Numbering
Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned
at: 0" + Indent at: 0.35"



164 14% of Osmocote™ versus $\text{NH}_4^+\text{-N}$ comprising only 6% of struvite ([Osmocote™](#)
165 manufacturer information, Kenworthy & Fonseca, 1992; Rahman et al., 2014). The P
166 composition of both fertilizers is also different, with struvite ([13% P as \$\text{PO}_4^{3-}\$](#)) versus
167 having a higher concentration by weight versus Osmocote™ ([13% P as \$\text{PO}_4^{3-}\$](#) versus
168 6.1% P as P_2O_5) ([Osmocote™ manufacturer information](#), Rahman et al., 2014).

169 In total, there were 30 plots, with an unplanted, untreated/unfertilized control
170 (labelled control, $n=4$), sediment-only treatments (labelled Control-Osmo and Control-
171 Struv, $n=4$), and seagrass control and treatments (labelled Seagrass, Seagrass-Osmo,
172 and Seagrass-Struv, $n=6$). Nutrient treatments were fertilized [with approximately by](#)
173 [adding the Osmocote™ or struvite equivalent of](#) 3 g of P mixed into approximately 6 kg
174 of sand (equivalent to 0.5 mg P g^{-1} DW sand), which was about half of what was
175 considered "[lightly low](#) fertilized" according to Peralta et al. (2003). ~~Each seagrass plot~~
176 ~~had exactly three individuals, each with five shoots. The first experiment was~~
177 ~~conducted for 60 days (Figure A.1). During this period, the levels of dissolved total P).~~
178 [The dosing was equilibrated to P as tropical seagrass systems are primarily P limited](#)
179 [\(Brodersen et al., 2017; Gras et al., 2003\). In this experiment, serving as pilot study, N](#)
180 [concentrations were not equilibrated, however given the actual fertilizer dosages,](#)
181 [concentrations were still below the low fertilized treatment in Peralta et al.'s study \(0.23](#)
182 [mg N \$\text{g}^{-1}\$ DW sand for struvite and 1.16 mg N \$\text{g}^{-1}\$ DW sand for Osmocote respectively\).](#)
183 [Each seagrass plot had exactly three individuals, each with five shoots. The first](#)
184 [experiment was conducted for 60 days. During this period, the levels of dissolved total](#)
185 [P porewater](#) concentrations were excessively high, exceeding 100 mg P L^{-1} in the
186 Osmocote™ treatments and 5 mg P L^{-1} for struvite.

187 **2.2.2. 2-2-2. Multi-Dose/Second Experiment**

188 In this second experiment, struvite doses were 0.0125 (low dose struvite or
 189 Seagrass-Struv-Lo), 0.025 (medium dose struvite or Seagrass-Struv-Med) and 0.05 mg
 190 P g⁻¹ DW sand (high dose struvite or Seagrass-Struv-Hi). For Osmocote™, 0.0125 (low
 191 dose Osmocote™ or Seagrass-Osmo-Lo) and 0.025 mg P g⁻¹ DW (medium dose
 192 Osmocote™ or Seagrass-Osmo-Med) doses were used. Unplanted, fertilized controls
 193 had a 0.0250 mg P g⁻¹ DW dose of Osmocote™ (Osmocote™ control or Control-Osmo)
 194 and struvite (struvite control or Control-Struv). Unfertilized, unplanted plots were
 195 labelled “control” while unfertilized, planted plots were labelled “unfertilized seagrass” or
 196 “Seagrass-Control”. There were four replicates for all controls/treatments. A high dose
 197 of Osmocote™ was not used due to space limitations in the mesocosm and concerns of
 198 overfertilization based on the results of the single dose/first experiment. There were
 199 three individuals with five shoots per plot (initially two individuals with the third added 10
 200 days post deployment to match the starting shoot count of the previous experiment).

201 **2.3.2-3. Plant and Nutrient Measurements**

202 Seagrass shoot count (seagrass shoots defined as a unit of several leaves or
 203 blades according to Short & Coles, (2001)), were quantified ~~in both experiments~~
 204 approximately every 10 days in both experiments. During the second experiment,
 205 blade/leaf lengths (substrate to leaf tip according to Arrington, (2008)) were also
 206 quantified. Surface water was sampled for temperature, salinity, and total dissolved
 207 nutrients (Total Dissolved N/TDN, Total Dissolved P/TDP), while porewater was only
 208 sampled for total nutrients and (randomly) sulfide presence. Surface and porewater
 209 samples were collected using a syringe sampler fashioned out of a 60 mL syringe
 10 attached to a plastic tube and 1 mL serological ~~4 mL~~ pipette with an attached air stone.

Formatted: Outline numbered + Level: 3 + Numbering
 Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned
 at: 0" + Indent at: 0.35"

Formatted: Outline numbered + Level: 2 + Numbering
 Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned
 at: 0" + Indent at: 0.3"


211 The samples were filtered through a 0.45 μm -~~pore size~~ filter (Whatman, Maidstone,
212 United Kingdom), preserved with sulfuric acid to a pH < 2, and stored at 4 °C until
213 analysis in the Wetland Biogeochemistry Laboratory (USEPA, 1974, 1993). Porewater
214 was also tested for the presence of sulfide, ~~which is toxic to seagrasses~~ (Calleja et al.,
215 2007; Carlson et al., 1994) using a Hach ~~testing test~~ kit (product number 2537800). No
216 measurable sulfide was found in any plots sampled (detection limit 0.1 mg L⁻¹). DOC
217 and TDN samples were analyzed on a Shimadzu TOC-L analyzer fitted with a N module
218 (Shimadzu Scientific Instruments, Durham, NC, USA) according to EPA method 415.1
219 for TOC and ASTM D 8083 for total nitrogen (TN) (ASTM International, 2016; Nevins et
220 al., 2020; USEPA, 1974). TDP was digested with persulfate in an autoclave and
221 analyzed via a Shimadzu UV-1800 spectrophotometer (Shimadzu Corporation, Kyoto,
222 Japan) using EPA method 365.1 (~~Tootoonchi et al., 2018; USEPA, 1993~~)(Irick et al.,
223 2015; USEPA, 1993).

224 At the end of the experiment, plant biomass and sediment were destructively
225 sampled. Plants were rinsed to clean off sediments, and promptly frozen. ~~Once at~~In
226 the lab, tissue samples were cleaned of epiphytes and rinsed with de-ionized water.
227 Plant tissue and sediment samples were dried for 72 hours at 65 °C, and ground using a
228 ball mill, ~~and~~. Sediment was analyzed for total carbon (TC), and nitrogen (TN), while
229 tissue was analyzed for TC, TN, and phosphorus (TP). Bulk sediment TC/TN were run
230 on an ECS 4010 CHNSO analyzer (Costech Analytical Technologies, Inc., Valencia,
231 CA, USA) (~~dry combustion method~~)(Nevins et al., 2020). Tissue TP was determined by
232 ashing the sample followed by dissolution with 6 M HCL (following Andersen, 1976) and
233 analysis for soluble P using a Shimadzu UV-1800 spectrophotometer (Shimadzu

234 Corporation, Kyoto, Japan) (~~Liao et al., 2016; USEPA, 1993~~)(Liao et al., 2019; USEPA,
 235 1993). Due to low and variable weights found after drying seagrass samples, plant dry
 236 biomass was calculated using a 10% wet weight conversion used for *H. wrightii* and
 237 *Thalassia testudinum* in Heck et al., (2015) and outlined in Short & Coles, (2001). A
 238 sediment particle analysis was also conducted to determine the distribution of particle
 239 sizes and possible changes over time. These samples were analyzed by the Soil and
 240 Water Sciences Environmental Pedology and Land Use Laboratory using laser
 241 diffraction (LD) with a Beckman Coulter LS-13320 multi-wave particle size analyzer
 242 (Beckman Coulter Diagnostics, Brea, CA, USA).

243 **2.4.2.4. Statistical Analyses**

244 Differences in seagrass metrics (shoot count and shoot length) and porewater
 245 nutrients for both experiments were calculated using a linear mixed model, followed by
 246 a post hoc multiple comparison significant (Fisher's Least Significant Difference test).
 247 Factors included the treatment type, date, and the interaction between treatment and
 248 date. A linear mixed model analysis was also conducted on sediment and biomass
 249 measurements from the second experiment, testing the effect of treatment type. The
 250 tests were run using JMP 15.2.1 (SAS Software, Cary, NC, USA) with significance set
 251 to $\alpha = 0.05$. To determine the fit of the model predictions to the measured data,
 252 residuals and qq-plots were visually inspected and data was log transformed as
 253 necessary (shoot counts, shoot lengths, and total dissolved nutrients). To differentiate
 254 between the effects of fertilization methods, K-means clustering was applied to classify
 255 all observations in the multi-dose/second experiment. K-means were computed using
 256 the `kmeans` function in R (version R-4.0.2.). Given the number of observations ($n = 6$) the
 257 data was predefined into two clusters (`centers = 2`). Prior to the analysis, the data was



Formatted: Outline numbered + Level: 2 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0" + Indent at: 0.3"

258 standardized using the `scale` function (each element is subtracted by the mean value of
 259 the vector and divided by standard deviation of the vector). The results were visualized
 260 using the `fviz_cluster` function (factoextra package) based on function's encoded
 261 principal component analysis (PCA) (Kassambara & Mundt, 2017)(Kassambara &
 262 Mundt, 2017).

263 **3. 3. Results**

264 ~~**2.1.1-3.1 Mesocosm Conditions**~~

265 ~~Mesocosm temperature and salinity remained between 27-31 °C and 33-38 ppt~~
 266 ~~respectively during the periods sampled (between 9 am and 3 pm) for both studies. The~~
 267 ~~hydraulic residence time was variable at 0.5-2 days, due to a limited saltwater supply.~~
 268 ~~The mean TDN of surface water was $0.44 \pm 0.06 \text{ mg N L}^{-1}$, while the mean TDP was~~
 269 ~~$0.035 \pm 0.001 \text{ mg P L}^{-1}$ (or $0.029 \text{ mg P L}^{-1}$ when excluding a day of low inflow). The~~
 270 ~~level of flow was great enough to prevent significant cross-contamination of the plots~~
 271 ~~studied, as well as prevent significant swings in temperature and salinity that could~~
 272 ~~stress the plants.~~

273 **3.1.3.2 Single Dose/First Experiment**

274 **3.1.1 Plant Metrics**

275 Increases in shoot counts occurred one month after transplantation for the
 276 struvite treatment. However, this was not the case with the unfertilized control or the
 277 Seagrass-Osmo treatment, which both slowly declined on average. At the end of the
 278 first experiment, mean ~~seagrass~~ shoot counts ranged from 6.33 ± 0.87 shoots in the
 279 Seagrass-Osmo treatment to 52.33 ± 5.49 shoots in the Seagrass-Struv treatment
 280 (Figure 1). ~~The effects of fertilizer treatment, date, and the treatment x date interaction~~
 31 ~~were significant for the shoot count (Table 1).~~ Seagrasses in Seagrass-Struvstruvite

Formatted: Outline numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering
 Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned
 at: 0" + Indent at: 0.25"

Formatted: Outline numbered + Level: 3 + Numbering
 Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned
 at: 0" + Indent at: 0.5"

Formatted: Outline numbered + Level: 2 + Numbering
 Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned
 at: 0" + Indent at: 0.3"



282 fertilized plots had significantly higher shoot counts than the seagrass control and
283 ~~Seagrass-Osmo overall ($t \geq 6.83$, Osmocote treatment ($p < 0.0001$), while there were no~~
284 ~~significant differences between the seagrass control and Seagrass-Osmo plots.01).~~

285 More specifically, the Seagrass-Struv treatment had a significantly higher shoot count in
286 mid-July, just one month after planting (~~$t = 2.30$, $p = \leq 0.024305$~~), becoming greater over
287 the next month (by end of the study ~~$t = 19.71$, $p < 0.0001001$~~). By the end of the study,
288 the unfertilized seagrass also had a significantly higher number of shoots than the
289 Seagrass-Osmo treatment ($t = 2.56$, $p = \leq 0.012405$).

290 ~~The effects of treatment, date, and the interaction between treatment and date were~~
291 ~~significant for porewater TDP (Table 1).~~ **3.1.2 Water Chemistry**

292 The TDP levels were significantly higher in the Seagrass-Osmo plots than the
293 unfertilized controls and Seagrass-Struv treatments (~~$t > 15.12$, $p < 0.0001$, table S1~~).
294 By the end of the study, the average TDP concentration for the Seagrass-Osmo
295 porewater plots was 136.09 ± 15.71 mg P L⁻¹ for the unplanted plots (Control-Osmo)
296 and 109.53 ± 19.96 mg P L⁻¹ for the planted plots (Seagrass-Osmo), more over ten
297 times higher than the struvite plots, which was 2.43 ± 0.61 mg P L⁻¹ in the unplanted
298 plots and 0.76 ± 0.19 mg P L⁻¹ in the Seagrass-Struv plots.

299 Porewater TDP in the Control-Struv treatment was significantly higher than the
300 control, unfertilized seagrass, and the Seagrass-Struv treatments (~~$t > 4.72$, $p <$~~
301 ~~0.0001001~~), indicating that significant uptake of TDP by seagrasses likely occurred.
302 There were no significant differences in TDP between the unplanted and planted
303 Seagrass-Osmo plots, overall or during any specific sampling date. ~~Over time, TDP~~
304 ~~concentrations in both the Control-Struv and Seagrass-Struv treatments significantly~~

Formatted: Font: Italic



305 increased by the end of the study ($t > 2.44$, $p < 0.02$) (Figure 1). Overall, the
 306 concentration of TDP in the Seagrass-Osmo plot porewater significantly increased over
 307 time ($t > 4.29$, $p < 0.0001$), with the Seagrass-Osmo fertilized plots increasing
 308 significantly in TDP between the first and second sample dates ($t > 3.74$, $p \leq 0.0005$).
 309 Subsequent sampling periods showed no statistically significant changes in TDP
 310 concentrations for the Control-Osmo or Seagrass-Osmo plots over time. There were no
 311 significant differences within or between the control and unfertilized seagrass plots.

3.2.3.3 Multi-Dose/Second Experiment

3.2.1. Plant Metrics

314 At the end of the second experiment, the average seagrass shoot counts ranged
 315 from 8.00 ± 0.41 shoots in the Seagrass-Control to 14.50 ± 3.10 shoots in the
 316 ~~Seagrass~~Seagrass-Struv-Med treatment (Figure 2). There was relatively less growth in
 317 the second experiment versus the first/single dose experiment, however the effects of
 318 date and its interaction with the treatment type were still significant for shoot count
 319 (Table 2). ~~The shoot count of the Seagrass-Control was significantly lower than the~~
 320 ~~Seagrass-Osmo-Low treatment ($t = 2.61$, $p = 0.0117$), Seagrass-Osmo-Med ($t = 3.01$, $p =$~~
 321 ~~0.0040), and the Lo/Med/Hi doses of struvite ($t = 3.88$, $p = 0.0003$, $t = 3.88$, $p = 0.0003$,~~
 322 ~~and $t = 3.06$, $p = 0.0034$ for the Lo, Med, and Hi doses, respectively) during the 10/05 or~~
 323 ~~Day 31 sampling. During the final sampling period (10/25 or 74 days after deployment),~~
 324 ~~struvite plots had significantly higher shoot counts than the Seagrass-Control ($t = 3.42$,~~
 325 ~~$p = 0.0012$, $t = 3.50$, $p = 0.0009$, and $t = 3.35$, $p = 0.0015$, for the Lo, Med, and Hi doses,~~
 326 ~~respectively), while there were not significant differences between Osmocote™ and the~~
 327 ~~Seagrass-Control (Figure 2). In addition, there were no significant differences between~~

Formatted: Outline numbered + Level: 2 + Numbering
 Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned
 at: 0" + Indent at: 0.3"



328 ~~the struvite and Osmocote™ treatments for shoot count~~(S-2). After 53 days, seagrass
329 ~~shoot count started showing signs of treatment effect in comparison to control seagrass~~
330 ~~plot which showed significant shoot count declines ($p < 0.05$) in comparison to the rest~~
331 ~~of the fertilized seagrass plots. By the end of the experiment (74 days) only the~~
332 ~~Seagrass-Struv-Med treated seagrass plots maintained plant density (14.50 ± 3.10~~
333 ~~shoots) close to the original coverage of 15 shoots per plot indicating high~~
334 ~~transplantation survival rate. At the conclusion of the study, only the struvite fertilized~~
335 ~~plots were statistically higher in shoot count than unfertilized plots.~~

336 The effects of both treatment and date were significant for blade length (Table
337 S-2). All fertilized treatments became significantly greater in length than the Seagrass-
338 Control ~~during and~~ after 39 days post deployment (Figure 2). The average seagrass
339 blade length ranged from 9.1 ± 1.02 cm in the unfertilized seagrass to 19.1 ± 1.74 cm in
340 the medium dose struvite. ~~Seagrass blade length in the Seagrass-Struv-Med was~~
341 ~~significantly higher than the Seagrass-Osmo-Lo ($t = 2.84, p = 0.0065, t = 3.62, p = 0.0007,$~~
342 ~~and $t = 4.40, p < 0.0001$ for the Seagrass-Osmo-Lo 39, 53, and 74 days after~~
343 ~~deployment, respectively) and Seagrass-Osmo-Med ($t = 3.13, p = 0.0029, t = 3.07, p =$~~
344 ~~$0.0036,$ and $t = 3.02, p = 0.004$ for the Seagrass-Osmo-Med at 39, 53, and 74 days after~~
345 ~~deployment, respectively). The Seagrass-Struv-Med treatment also had a significantly~~
346 ~~higher shoot length than the Seagrass-Struv-Lo 53 ($p = 0.0276$) and 74 days after~~
347 ~~deployment ($p = 0.0257$).~~ by the end of the experiment. The highest increase in blade
348 ~~length was observed in struvite treatments. The Seagrass-Struv-Med treatment showed~~
349 ~~a significantly ($p < 0.005$) higher blade growth than the Seagrass-Osmo-Lo/Med~~
350 ~~treatments.~~

Formatted: Font: Times New Roman

351 The mean aboveground biomass ranged from 0.012 ± 0.004 g DW in the
352 Seagrass-Control to 0.080 ± 0.011 g DW in the Seagrass-Struv-Hi treatment (Figure
353 [43](#)), with the effect of treatment type being significant (Table [3](#)). ~~For S-3). All fertilized~~
354 ~~plots had significantly higher~~ aboveground biomass, ~~the Seagrass-Control was~~
355 ~~significantly lower~~ than the Seagrass-Osmo-Med ($t = 1.53, p = 0.045$), low ($t = 2.60, p =$
356 0.018), medium ($t = 4.07, p = 0.0007$), and high dose struvite ($t = 4.03, p = 0.0008$) (Figure
357 [3](#)). ~~Med and Hi dose struvite treatments were significantly higher in aboveground~~
358 ~~biomass than control, except for the Seagrass-Osmo-Lo ($t = 2.54, p = 0.0205$ and $t =$~~
359 $2.50, p = 0.0225$ for medium and high dose struvite). ~~Marginal treatment ($p < 0.05$).~~
360 ~~There was a marginal~~ significance ~~was also~~ found for the Med and Hi struvite
361 ~~treatments/doses~~ having a higher aboveground biomass than the Seagrass-Osmo-Med
362 ($t = 1.92, p = 0.0713$ and $t = 1.87, p = 0.0775$ for Med and Hi dose struvite, respectively).
363 $p < 0.08$. Belowground biomass ranged from 0.11 ± 0.02 g DW in the Seagrass-
364 Control to 0.20 ± 0.01 g DW in the ~~high dose struvite~~ Seagrass-Struv-Med treatment
365 (Figure [43](#)). The ~~effect of treatment type was also significant for~~ belowground biomass
366 ~~of control plots was significantly lower compared to all fertilized plots except for the~~
367 Seagrass-Osmo-Med (Table [S-3](#)). ~~The Seagrass-Osmo-Lo, Seagrass-Struv-Lo,~~
368 ~~and Additionally, the~~ Seagrass-Struv-Med ~~were/dose had~~ significantly higher ~~than the~~
369 Seagrass-Control ($t = 2.47, p = 0.0238, t = 2.57, p = 0.0194, and t = 3.98, p = 0.0009$, for
370 belowground biomass compared to the Seagrass-Osmo-Lo, Med and Seagrass-Struv-
371 Lo, and Seagrass-Struv-Med, respectively). Additionally, the Seagrass-Struv-Med was
372 significantly higher than both the Seagrass-Struv-Hi ($t = 2.24, p = 0.0378$) and the
373 Seagrass-Osmo-Med ($t = 2.93, p = 0.0089$).





374 At the end of the experiment, the mean porewater TDN concentration ranged
375 from 1.68 ± 0.15 mg N L⁻¹ in the Seagrass-Control to 17.26 ± 4.98 mg N L⁻¹ in the
376 Seagrass-Osmo-Med (Table A.1). Only the effect of the treatment type was significant
377 for TDN (Table 2). Overall, the porewater TDN concentrations for the Control-Osmo
378 and planted Seagrass-Osmo-Med were significantly higher than the controls and the
379 struvite treatments ($t \geq 2.06$, $p \leq 0.0423$). The Seagrass-Osmo-Lo was significantly
380 higher in TDN than all treatments except the Seagrass-Osmo-Med and the Seagrass-
381 Struv-Hi treatment ($t \geq 2.01$, $p \leq 0.0473$). All struvite doses were significantly higher in
382 TDN than both the unplanted control and Seagrass-Control ($t \geq 3.62$, $p \leq 0.0005$).

383 The mean porewater TDP concentrations ranged from 0.084 ± 0.021 mg P L⁻¹ in
384 the Seagrass-Control to 0.551 ± 0.105 mg P L⁻¹ in the Seagrass-Osmo-Med at the end
385 of the experiment. The effects of treatment and date were significant for porewater TDP
386 (Table 2). Similarly, the unplanted control and Seagrass-Control had significantly lower
387 TDP than all fertilized plots ($t \geq 4.68$, $p \leq 0.0001$). The Seagrass-Osmo-Med was
388 significantly higher than all other controls/treatments except the equivalently dosed
389 unplanted Osmocote™ treatment ($t \geq 3.38$, $p \leq 0.001$), while Seagrass-Osmo-Lo was
390 significantly higher than the controls and the equivalently dosed (P basis) struvite
391 treatment ($t \geq 4.05$, $p \leq 0.0001$). Marginal significance was also found for the Seagrass-
392 Osmo-Lo being higher in porewater TDP than the Seagrass-Struv-Med ($t = 1.92$, $p =$
393 0.0569). Over time, TDP concentrations appeared to fluctuate greatly between fertilized
394 treatments, while remaining stable for unfertilized controls. Between the two highest
395 peaks (Day 6 and Day 31), Osmocote™ plots had a significant reduction in porewater



396 ~~TDP concentration ($t = 3.06$, $p = 0.0028$, $t = 2.81$, $p = 0.0059$, and $t = 2.44$, $p = 0.0164$ for~~
397 ~~the Osmo-Control and Lo/Med Osmocote™ treatments, respectively).~~

398 Hi doses ($p < 0.05$). Aboveground tissue %TN ranged from 1.9% in the
399 unfertilized seagrass (one sample) to $2.34 \pm 0.23\%$ in the Seagrass-Struv-Lo treatment,
400 while tissue %TP ranged from $0.236 \pm 0.007\%$ in the Seagrass-Struv-Lo treatment to
401 $0.258 \pm 0.016\%$ in the Seagrass-Osmo-Lo treatment (Table [A.3S-7](#)). There was no
402 significant effect of treatment on aboveground %TN or %TP (Table 4). ~~This lack of~~
403 ~~significant difference is possibly due to the absence of available control replicates. For~~
404 ~~example, the aboveground control only had a single combined sample (from $n=4$).~~ The
405 mean aboveground N:P ratios ranged between 8.3 ± 0.57 for the Seagrass-Osmo-Lo
406 and 10.0 ± 1.20 for Seagrass-Struv-Lo treatment. ~~The N:P ratio and the mean~~
407 ~~aboveground TN and TP weights in the seagrasses (calculated by multiplying the~~
408 ~~biomass with the tissue %TN or %TP) yielded no significant differences (Tables [5S-4](#)~~
409 ~~and [A.3](#)).~~

410 7). Belowground tissue %TN ranged from $0.53 \pm 0.07\%$ for the Seagrass-Osmo-
411 Lo treatment to $0.84 \pm 0.06\%$ in the Seagrass-Osmo-Med treatment, while tissue %TP
412 ranged from $0.154 \pm 0.009\%$ for the Seagrass-Osmo-Lo treatment to $0.179 \pm 0.008\%$
413 for the Seagrass-Osmo-Med treatment (~~Table A.3~~). The effect of treatment type was
414 significant for belowground %TN (Table 4), with the Seagrass-Osmo-Med being
415 significantly higher than the Seagrass-Osmo-Lo (~~$t = 3.43$, $p = 0.003705$~~). No effects
416 were significant for belowground %TP. The mean belowground N:P ratio ranged from
417 3.4 ± 0.47 for the Seagrass-Osmo-Lo and 4.7 ± 0.36 for the Seagrass-Osmo-Med
418 treatment (~~Table A.3~~). ~~Similarly, no significant differences in the belowground N:P~~



419 ratios were found. However, the The effect of treatment type was significant for both
420 the belowground mass of TN and TP (% total nutrient x biomass, Table 5). ~~For~~
421 ~~belowground TN weight, the Seagrass-Struv-Med was significantly higher than the~~
422 ~~Seagrass-Control ($t=3.38, p=0.0041$) and the Seagrass-Osmo-Lo ($t=2.66, p=0.0177$).~~
423 ~~For the belowground TP weight, the Seagrass-Struv-Med was significantly higher than~~
424 ~~the Seagrass-Control ($t=3.67, p=0.0023$) and the Seagrass-Osmo-Med ($t=2.22, p=$
425 0.0421). Additionally, the Seagrass-Struv-Lo was significantly higher than the~~
426 ~~Seagrass-Control ($t=2.59, p=0.0205$).~~S-5).

427 **3.2.2. Water, Tissue, and Sediment Chemistry**

428 Nutrient dynamics in porewater differ significantly between the fertilizer types
429 indicating different dissolution kinetics and plant and substrate interaction. Unfertilized
430 control plots (planted and unplanted) showed variable TDN concentrations throughout
431 the experiment however, never surpassing 2 mg TDN L⁻¹. Background porewater TDP
432 content in observed controls varied within 0.05-0.15 mg TDP L⁻¹. The biggest nutrient
433 release was observed at plots fertilized with Osmocote with peak nutrient
434 concentrations occurring at 6th day of experiment reaching 26.8 ± 7.53 mg TDN L⁻¹ and
435 17.68 ± 6.74 mg TDP L⁻¹ for medium Osmocote dose. TDP dynamics in struvite
436 seagrass treatments were highly variable throughout the time and showed alternating
437 pulses of TDP release. However, by the end of the experiment porewater TDP content
438 in struvite fertilized plots was 2-3 times lower than in respective Osmocote treatments.
439 DOC measured at the end of the study was between 12.26 ± 0.67 mg DOC L⁻¹ for
440 Seagrass-Struv-Lo and 14.71 ± 1.23 mg DOC L⁻¹ for Seagrass-Osmo-Lo.

441 The average TC content of sediment ranged from 48.7 ± 5.02 g C kg⁻¹ in the
 442 medium dose struvite to 58.2 ± 5.63 g C kg⁻¹ in the Seagrass-Struv-Hi, while the
 443 average TN content ranged from 2.02 ± 0.032 g N kg⁻¹ in the Seagrass-Control to $2.10 \pm$
 444 0.020 g kg⁻¹ in the Seagrass-Struv-Hi treatment (Table A.5). ~~The TP content of~~
 445 ~~sediment was not measured due to the high variability of replicates (possibly caused by~~
 446 ~~the large grain size of the sediment and/or the granular nature of the fertilizers, creating~~
 447 ~~regions of low/high nutrients). S-6).~~ There were no significant differences in the TC or
 448 TN contents between treatments (Table A.6S-7).

449 ~~Nutrient dynamics (TN, TOC and TDP), above and belowground biomass, and~~
 450 ~~shoot count data~~ Porewater nutrients and seagrass metrics were used to further assess
 451 the global effect of fertilization dose and method based on multivariate analysis. K-
 452 means clustering detected two separate groups. The struvite treatment was clearly
 453 distinguished from the Osmocote™ treatment and control plot, occupying separated,
 454 non-overlapping clusters on the PCA plane (Figure 4), reinforcing the significant effects
 455 of struvite on seagrass and its surrounding environment.

456 **4. Discussion**

457 **4.1.4.1 Factors in Seagrass Performance**

458 ~~In all but the Seagrass-Osmo in the first experiment, fertilizer~~ Fertilizer application
 459 improved seagrass metrics compared to the unfertilized control, ~~including in all but the~~
 460 ~~Seagrass-Osmo treatment of the first experiment. This included average~~ shoot count
 461 (more than six times higher vs the control at the end of the first experiment, and ~~41% or~~
 462 ~~more~~ up to 81% at the end of the second experiment), length (~~32% or greater~~ up to 110%
 463 at the end of the second experiment, Figure 2), and biomass (~~52% or greater~~ up to
 464 138% at the end of the second experiment, Figure 3). In general, these results support

Formatted: Outline numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0" + Indent at: 0.25"

Formatted: Outline numbered + Level: 2 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0" + Indent at: 0.3"

465 past findings examining the effects of fertilizer ~~in the restoration techniques in of~~
466 seagrass ecosystems (~~Armitage et al., 2011; Kenworthy et al., 2018~~)(~~Armitage et al.,~~
467 ~~2011; Kenworthy et al., 2018~~). Additionally, the results of this study found that
468 ~~compared to equivalent P dosages with Osmocote,~~ fertilization using struvite resulted in
469 higher average seagrass shoot count (more than ~~sixeight~~ times higher by the end of the
470 first experiment, and ~~60% or more compared to the Seagrass-Struv-Med~~29% at the end
471 of the second experiment), length (~~36% or more compared to the Seagrass-Struv-~~
472 ~~Med~~up to 36% at the end of the second experiment, Figure 2), and biomass (~~40-up to~~
473 60% higher total biomass ~~compared to the Seagrass-Struv-Med~~ at the end of the
474 second experiment, Figure 3) ~~compared to equivalent doses of Osmocote™~~. The
475 significant multivariate improvements in plant metrics ~~produced~~ in both experiments are
476 promising towards the use of struvite as a fertilizer to rapidly establish seagrass species
477 in future restoration efforts.

478 In addition to improving seagrass metrics, struvite consistently ~~appeared to~~
479 ~~releaser~~released less nutrients than Osmocote™. Porewater TDN was excessive in the
480 Osmocote™ treatment in the first experiment (~~the sample readings were out of range, x~~
481 ~~> 10 (> 100 mg/L without dilutions);~~). In the second experiment, TDN in struvite
482 ~~introduced TDN treated plots~~ was only as low as 12% of Osmocote™ ~~released TDN~~
483 ~~experiment treated plots~~ (Table S-48). Porewater TDP in equivalent struvite doses was
484 less than 2% TDP of Osmocote™ in the first experiment (Figure 1), and as low as 10%
485 P of Osmocote™ in equivalent struvite doses in the second experiment (Table S-48).
486 The speed of nutrient release by Osmocote™ was so high, that it may have contributed
487 to the decreased performance of the Osmocote™ treatments through excessive N

488 levels, as evidenced by roots that appeared stunted from possible root burn (observed
489 in the first experiment, [Figure S-1](#)), commonly associated with N exposure (NC State,
490 2018; Schönau & Herbert, 1983). ~~This~~

491 ~~The possible root burn in Osmocote™ treated seagrass~~ may be the result of
492 nitrate ~~specifically, as it is included in the Osmocote™ blend and was found to inhibit~~
493 ~~seagrass biomass in past fertilization studies~~ (Peralta et al., 2003; Statton et al., 2014).
494 ~~Alternatively, toxicity may have been caused by the ammonia fraction in the Osmocote,~~
495 ~~as NH_x forms are also toxic to seagrasses, especially at low biomass levels or ammonia~~
496 (van der Heide et al., 2008) ~~fractions in the fertilizer~~. However, previous seagrass
497 (*Zostera marina*) mesocosm studies have detected increased seagrass metrics
498 following Osmocote™ fertilization. For example, *Zostera marina* plants were found to
499 have increased shoot counts after one month of Osmocote™ 14:14:14 NPK fertilizer
500 exposure compared to unfertilized plots (Wang et al., 2020). Similarly, another study
501 found significant differences in shoot length in *Z. marina* over a period of two months
502 when exposed to fertilizer doses higher than those used in this study (Peralta et al.,
503 2003). In these cases, it should be noted that *Z. marina* exhibited a “remarkable
504 tolerance” of N and P fertilization, and many species of seagrass may not be as flexible
505 regarding higher levels of nutrient exposure.

506 Another factor affecting the difference between struvite and Osmocote™ could
507 be the balance of N versus P. In the second experiment, the aboveground tissue N:P
508 ratios ~~(8.3 ± 0.57 to 10.0 ± 1.20, Table S-9)~~ consistently exceeded the traditionally
509 accepted threshold for a balanced nutrient supply. ~~The mean N:P ratios ranged~~
510 ~~between 8.3 ± 0.57 to 10.0 ± 1.20 (Table S-2), while a for seagrasses (14 weight N:P~~



511 ratio calculated from the 30:1 molar N:P ratio as provided by Atkinson & Smith, [1983] ~~is~~
512 ~~considered balanced for seagrass-]).~~ A study of *H. wrightii* found that in a natural
513 system (Florida Bay) the molar N:P was over 20, while in ~~an enriched scenario (a~~
514 fertilized ~~with scenario (using~~ bird roosting stakes) the ratio was approximately 13
515 (Powell et al., 1989). Thus, the authors argued that *H. wrightii* was P limited in ~~an~~
516 ~~unenriched a natural~~ setting, and N limited ~~in the enriched setting when fertilized.~~
517 Another study in Florida Bay found that *H. wrightii* was “released” from P limitation
518 ~~had a~~ tissue ~~weight to N:P~~ weight ratios ~~of~~ between 9.7 and 21 (Armitage et al., 2011).
519 Generally, the *H. wrightii* in all fertilized plots did not appear to be strongly limited by a
520 specific nutrient, exceeding the 1.8% TN/ 0.2% TP tissue nutrient requirement defined
521 by Duarte (1990). The exception to this may have been the control, which was closer to
522 N limitation than all plots with a 1.9% TN tissue content, although this conclusion is
523 tenuous because only one replicate was able to be analyzed due to a lack of biomass.

524 The lack of significant differences in tissue nutrient content between fertilized and
525 non-fertilized treatments may be due to delays in nutrient response by the plants. For
526 example, one study found that it took *Thalassia testudinum* four months to acquire
527 elevated N levels after fertilizer exposure, while elevated P levels in plants took up to 14
528 months to develop (Ferdie & Fourqurean, 2004). While *H. wrightii* is a faster growing
529 species, and higher growth was demonstrated in fertilized vs non-fertilized plots, the
530 limited experiment duration may not have fully captured long-term increases in tissue
531 content. However, significant differences in belowground nutrient content (i.e. medium
532 dose struvite vs. non-fertilized control, Table S-4) and tissue nutrient weight ~~may~~ (Table
533 S-5) indicate uptake of nutrients by the seagrass.



534 ~~The surface and porewater results appear to support N limitation of the~~
535 ~~mesocosm environment, with all controls/treatments having a TDN/TDP ratio of less~~
536 ~~than 20 (most notably porewater TDN/TDP ratio of the unplanted control at 12.7 ± 1.71 ,~~
537 ~~and the unfertilized seagrass at 10.0 ± 1.89 , Table S-1). Thus, the results of the~~
538 ~~experiment and past studies appear to support the argument that seagrasses in this~~
539 ~~study were either nutrient balanced or slightly N limited. In this case, the likely lack of~~
540 ~~severe N limitation, combined with the high levels of porewater nutrients, potentially~~
541 ~~indicates that the N content of struvite (6% by weight) is sufficient to improve seagrass~~
542 ~~growth in this system.~~

543 Furthermore, the size of the mesocosm plots may have been a factor in the high
544 porewater nutrient levels ~~found in the experiment~~ by preventing lateral flow of porewater
545 and limiting diffusion. The current flow and increased sediment depth may dilute
546 porewater, increase diffusion, and reduce the effectiveness of fertilizers in a natural
547 environment, requiring more fertilizer for field studies. This potential problem may be
548 partially compensated by the relatively large grain size of the shelly sand used in the
549 study, compared to the often silty sand found in seagrass systems (a property produced
550 by seagrass beds as discussed in Folmer et al., 2012). The lack of sulfide present in
551 the experiment also indicates a higher redox potential that is likely not present in field
552 experiments.

553 This study demonstrated that struvite and Osmocote™ both released N and P
554 ~~unabated~~ for at least two months (Table S-4~~8~~). Based off on longer studies ~~using~~
555 ~~Osmocote™~~, it is expected that ~~the~~ Osmocote™ would provide N and P for ~~a couple~~
556 ~~more months, totaling 4-6 months based on~~ (Hall et al., (2006) ~~and~~ Olsen and Valiela (

557 2010). Struvite may be able to provide nutrients for longer periods, indicated by its
558 slower release rate. After the second experiment, ~~the~~selected fertilized plots were
559 moved to another mesocosm and left submerged. A year after the experiment was
560 deployed, the only evidence found of the Osmocote™ fertilizer were the outer
561 membranes of the prills, whereas struvite granules were still found in the mesocosm
562 plots, indicating a potential continued release of nutrients. ~~While~~Thus, while the effects
563 of struvite were only measured for up to nine weeks, the presence of struvite after this
564 extended period indicates that struvite could be effective throughout a whole growing
565 season or longer. The ability of struvite to produce higher seagrass metrics while
566 emitting less nutrients (indicating a more sustained release of nutrients over a longer
567 period of time) is promising toward the future applications of struvite in future coastal
568 restoration efforts.

569 4.2. Field Applications of the Study

570 The controlled environment of the mesocosm study allowed tests to be done with
571 minimal interference from the confounding variables of a field study. However, several
572 external factors may still have affected the results of the two experiments. The first
573 experiment was conducted at the peak of the seagrass growing season (June through
574 August), whereas the second experiment occurred during the end of the season
575 (August through October, with the season typically ending in September; Choice et al.,
576 2014). The later date of deployment could help explain why ~~the~~ differences between
577 shoot counts were not as apparent in the second experiment ~~compared to the first.~~
578 Based on the declining seagrass performance ~~found when exceeding above~~ the
579 medium/0.025 mg P g⁻¹ DW dose, there may have been even larger differences in the



580 first experiment between struvite and Osmocote™ if the second experiment was begun
581 earlier in the summer.

582 4.2 When considering the broad applicability of the results, it is important to note
583 how close the conditions in the mesocosm were mimicking the natural environment.
584 First, the local sediment substrate was not sterilized and contained a representative
585 microbial population. Similarly, seawater for the mesocosm was only prefiltered to
586 minimize inputs of algae or debris, and largely maintained the natural composition and
587 physiochemistry. The mesocosm environment was sheltered from hydrodynamic
588 disturbance and herbivory which are significant problems in field restoration efforts
589 (Bourque & Fourqurean, 2013; W. Kenworthy et al., 2018; Tuya et al., 2017). However,
590 there are numerous techniques such as protective cages, or biodegradable lattices,
591 artificial seagrass, in ground fertilizer application, and sediment tubes that aim to
592 minimize environmental disturbances and which can be successfully integrated into
593 restoration projects utilizing fertilizers (Hall et al., 2006; Hammerstrom et al., 1998; W. J.
594 Kenworthy et al., 2018; Li et al., 2019; MacDonnell et al., 2022; Temmink et al., 2020;
595 Tuya et al., 2017).

596 Multiple field and mesocosm seagrass studies investigating the use of
597 Osmocote™ have yielded generally similar results (Peralta et al., 2003; Pereda-Briones
598 et al., 2018; Tanner & Parham, 2010). Both struvite/Osmocote™ experiments could be
599 considered extensions of these previous investigations with real world applications.
600 However, it must be noted that a successful mesocosm scale study such as this one
601 cannot simply be scaled up to field applications. Rather, it would require the additional
602 understanding of local environmental conditions and applied restoration techniques that

603 enhance the success rate. Therefore, a future field study would be recommended to
 604 optimize the dose of struvite in different biogeochemical conditions and assess
 605 associated operational efforts and costs.

606 **4.3. Implications/Applications of Struvite**

607 The integration of struvite in restoration projects could have multiple advantages
 608 ~~concerning for~~ both ~~future~~ environmental management and sustainability of wastewater
 609 treatment. First, more research is needed, but struvite is potentially less harmful for the
 610 environment than ~~traditionally available, traditional~~ commercial fertilizers. For example,
 611 struvite is sourced from wastewater, a source of eutrophication for many coastal
 612 systems (Mayer et al., 2016). The N content of struvite is also relatively low, and while
 613 it still provides plants with nutrients, it limits excess fertilization and resulting nitrous
 614 oxide emissions (Rahman et al., 2014). Second, ~~that~~ struvite ~~has the potential to be a~~
 615 ~~sustainable, and~~ locally sourced ~~fertilizer. This could have~~ has global implications as P
 616 resources are being depleted in an accelerating rate, and there are indications that
 617 demand will surpass supply within the next 20 years ~~(Nedelciu et al., 2020)(Nedelciu et~~
 618 ~~al., 2020)~~. The processing of struvite allows for the production of a P fertilizer without
 619 dealing with the instability and increasing costs of importing fertilizer ~~(Rufi-Salis et al.,~~
 620 ~~2020; Ye et al., 2020)(Rufi-Salis et al., 2020; Ye et al., 2020)~~. Finally, the feasibility of
 621 using struvite on multiple scales has been demonstrated in experiments and industrial
 622 applications, indicating a practical and readily available treatment process ~~(Ghosh et al.,~~
 623 ~~2019).(Ghosh et al., 2019)~~.

624 The advantages of struvite in reducing pollution and phosphate shortages,
 625 combined with its feasibility, make it an attractive ~~option as an~~ alternative P and N
 626 fertilizer. Struvite is a ~~widely~~-recognized slow--release terrestrial nutrient amendment

Formatted: Outline numbered + Level: 2 + Numbering
 Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned
 at: 0" + Indent at: 0.3"



627 ~~characterized~~ with a low environmental footprint. However, struvite application ~~in~~
628 ~~agriculture~~ is still limited due to its high price in comparison to conventional mineral
629 fertilizers and availability. Therefore, extending application of struvite into ~~non-~~
630 ~~agricultural applications~~ areas such as restoration could potentially create a new market
631 ~~and consequently lower the price~~, thus making struvite more affordable and available.
632 This is particularly important since struvite represents a very important aspect of circular
633 economy in water management.

634 5. 5. Summary and Conclusions

635 Because of the current need for effective fertilization methods that minimize
636 environmental risk, this study evaluated the wastewater by-product struvite and its
637 potential to enhance seagrass growth under simulated natural conditions. ~~Within the~~
638 ~~fertilizer types, seagrass~~ Seagrass growth metrics (shoots, length, biomass) in plots
639 fertilized with struvite were consistently equal to or better than ~~a common~~ the
640 commercial fertilizer Osmocote™. This improvement in seagrass performance was
641 provided while also producing lower porewater nutrient release from equal P fertilization
642 doses, likely due to the slower release of nutrients from struvite delivering a low but
643 sustained load of N and P to the rhizosphere. Excessive N inputs from the Osmocote™
644 treatment in the first experiment may have even reduced performance of treated plots
645 compared to the unfertilized control. Measurements of porewater nutrients and visual
646 observations indicated that struvite has a lower solubility and is therefore longer lasting
647 compared to Osmocote™ in marine conditions. Other possible factors in plant
648 performance, including the effects of specific nutrients (i.e. temporal delays in N/P
649 tissue concentration, micronutrient differences), current flow (possibly increasing

Formatted: Outline numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering
Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned
at: 0" + Indent at: 0.25"

650 nutrient diffusion), and sediment particle size (affecting dissolution rates and redox
651 potential), will require further investigation.

652 ~~In the future, Future~~ studies should apply the results of this experiment ~~in the field~~
653 in multiple coastal systems, ensuring that results are not constrained to a seagrass
654 mesocosm setting. Testing the solubility of struvite in different environments may reveal
655 more applications for the fertilizer ~~in different environments. Ideally, Experiments~~
656 ~~should include other seagrass species with diverse nutrient requirements, and ideally, a~~
657 restoration experiment would take place over multiple growing seasons to determine
658 how long struvite remains effective. Special consideration should also be given toward
659 testing the effectiveness of struvite ~~versus Osmocote™~~ in a heavily more N-limited
660 environment, ~~as Osmocote™ where other fertilizers~~ may have ana better advantage ~~due~~
661 ~~to higher N content~~. This study was a first ever attempt to apply struvite in marine
662 restoration project, serving as an example of interdisciplinary ~~merger~~ between
663 wastewater treatment engineering and restoration ecology. The ~~obtained~~ positive
664 results here should encourage future research and field activities to further explore
665 ~~struvite~~ the application of struvite and similar materials for restoration projects ~~in both~~
666 ~~terrestrial and aquatic environment~~.

667 **Funding Sources:**

668 This work was supported by a University of Florida Graduate Student Fellowship,
669 the Wetland Biogeochemistry Laboratory, and other funding from the Soil and Water
670 Sciences Department at the University of Florida. Franciszek F. Bydalek was supported
671 by faculty of the Civil and Environmental Engineering department and the Gdańsk
672 University of Technology Fund for Young Scientists (2017/032455).

673 **Acknowledgements**

674 The authors acknowledge [LindseyL.](#) Mikell of the UF Wetlands Biogeochemistry
675 Laboratory for her help [with water quality analyses](#), and Dr. [AlanA.](#) Bacon for help in
676 sediment particle size analyses. We thank [SavannaDr. S.](#) Barry, the Florida
677 Oceanographic Society, the Whitney Laboratory for Marine Biosciences, and Dr.
678 [LauraL.](#) Reynolds for recommendations regarding seagrass transplantation and study
679 designs. Special thanks are addressed to James Colee from the IFAS statistical
680 consulting unit for confirming the quality of the data and the subsequent analyses.

681



682

683 **References**

- 684 Andersen, J. (1976). An ignition method for determination of total phosphorus in lake
685 sediments. *Water Research*, 10(4), 329–331. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0043-](https://doi.org/10.1016/0043-1354(76)90175-5)
686 1354(76)90175-5
- 687 Armitage, A., Frankovich, T., & Fourqurean, J. (2011). Long-term effects of adding
688 nutrients to an oligotrophic coastal environment. *Ecosystems*, 14, 430–444.
689 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10021-011-9421-2>
- 690 Armitage, A. R., & Fourqurean, J. W. (2016). Carbon storage in seagrass soils: Long-
691 term nutrient history exceeds the effects of near-term nutrient enrichment.
692 *Biogeosciences*, 13(1), 313–321. <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-13-313-2016>
- 693 Arrington, D. A. (2008). *Loxahatchee River water quality and biological monitoring task*
694 *13B: Final report spatial and temporal dynamics of seagrass in the Loxahatchee*
695 *River estuary during the period October 2007- September 2008*. 19.
- 696 ASTM International. (2016). *D8083-16 Standard Test Method for Total Nitrogen, and*
697 *Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen (TKN) by Calculation, in Water by High Temperature*
698 *Catalytic Combustion and Chemiluminescence Detection*. ASTM International.
699 <https://doi.org/10.1520/D8083-16>
- 700 Atkinson, M. J., & Smith, S. V. (1983). C:N:P ratios of benthic marine ~~plants~~plants.
701 *Limnology and Oceanography*, 28(3), 568–574.
702 <https://doi.org/10.4319/lo.1983.28.3.0568>
- 703 Balestri, E., & Lardicci, C. (2014). Effects of ~~Sediment Fertilization~~sediment fertilization
704 and ~~Burial~~burial on *Cymodocea nodosa* ~~Transplants~~transplants; Implications for
705 ~~Seagrass Restoration Under~~seagrass restoration under a ~~Changing~~Changing

Formatted: Font: Italic





- 706 ~~Climatechanging climate~~. *Restoration Ecology*, 22(2), 240–247.
707 <https://doi.org/10.1111/rec.12052>
- 708 Bayraktarov, E., Saunders, M. I., Abdullah, S., Mills, M., Beher, J., Possingham, H. P.,
709 Mumby, P. J., & Lovelock, C. E. (2016). The cost and feasibility of marine coastal
710 restoration. *Ecological Applications*, 26(4), 1055–1074.
711 <https://doi.org/10.1890/15-1077>
- 712 Biber, P., Caldwell, J. D., & Marenberg, M. (2013). CPR *Halodule wrightii*. *University of*
713 *Southern Mississippi*.
- 714 Bourque, A. S., & Fourqurean, J. W. (2013). Variability in herbivory in subtropical
715 seagrass ecosystems and implications for seagrass transplanting. *Journal of*
716 *Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, 445, 29–37.
717 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jembe.2013.03.014>
- 718 Bourque, A. S., & Fourqurean, J. W. (2014). Effects of common seagrass restoration
719 methods on ecosystem structure in subtropical seagrass meadows. *Marine*
720 *Environmental Research*, 97, 67–78.
721 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marenvres.2014.03.001>
- 722 Brodersen, K. E., Koren, K., Moßhammer, M., Ralph, P. J., Kühl, M., & Santner, J.
723 (2017). Seagrass-mediated phosphorus and iron solubilization in tropical
724 sediments. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 51(24), 14155–14163.
725 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.7b03878>
- 726 Bydątek, F., Kula, A., & Maćkonia, J. (2018). Morphology and ~~Elemental~~
727 ~~Composition~~elemental composition of ~~Product Obtained~~product obtained from
728 ~~Struvite Fluidized Bed Reactor~~struvite fluidized bed reactor. *Civil and*

Formatted: Font: Italic

729 *Environmental Engineering Reports*, 28(2), 139–149.
730 <https://doi.org/10.2478/ceer-2018-0025>

731 Cabeza, R., Steingrobe, B., Römer, W., & Claassen, N. (2011). Effectiveness of
732 recycled P products as P fertilizers, as evaluated in pot experiments. *Nutrient*
733 *Cycling in Agroecosystems*, 91(2), 173. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10705-011-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10705-011-9454-0)
734 9454-0

735 Calleja, M. Ll., Marbà, N., & Duarte, C. M. (2007). The relationship between seagrass
736 (*Posidonia oceanica*) decline and sulfide porewater concentration in carbonate
737 sediments. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, 73(3), 583–588.
738 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2007.02.016>

739 Carlson, P., Yarbrow, L., & Barber, T. (1994). Relationship of ~~Sediment Sulfide~~
740 ~~sulfide~~ to ~~Mortality~~ mortality of *Thalassia Testudinum testudinum* in Florida Bay.
741 *Bulletin of Marine Science*, 54, 733–746.

742 Choice, Z. D., Frazer, T. K., & Jacoby, C. A. (2014). Light requirements of seagrasses
743 determined from historical records of light attenuation along the Gulf coast of
744 peninsular Florida. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 81(1), 94–102.
745 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2014.02.015>

746 Duarte, C. M. (1990). Seagrass nutrient content. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*,
747 67(2), 201–207.

748 Ferdie, M., & Fourqurean, J. W. (2004). Responses of seagrass communities to
749 fertilization along a gradient of relative availability of nitrogen and phosphorus in
750 a carbonate environment. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 49(6), 2082–2094.
751 <https://doi.org/10.4319/lo.2004.49.6.2082>

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

- 752 Fereidooni, M., Raiesi, F., & Fallah, S. (2013). Ecological restoration of soil respiration,
753 microbial biomass and enzyme activities through broiler litter application in a
754 calcareous soil cropped with silage maize. *Ecological Engineering*, 58, 266–277.
755 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoleng.2013.06.032>
- 756 Folmer, E. O., van der Geest, M., Jansen, E., Olff, H., Michael Anderson, T., Piersma,
757 T., & van Gils, J. A. (2012). Seagrass–sediment feedback: An exploration using a
758 non-recursive structural equation model. *Ecosystems*, 15(8), 1380–1393.
759 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10021-012-9591-6>
- 760 Fonseca, M. S., Kenworthy, W. J., Courtney, F. X., & Hall, M. O. (1994). Seagrass
761 Planting in the Southeastern United States: Methods for Accelerating Habitat
762 Development. *Restoration Ecology*, 2(3), 198–212.
763 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1526-100X.1994.tb00067.x>
- 764 Fonseca, M. S., Kenworthy, W. J., & Thayer, G. W. (1998). *Guidelines for the*
765 *conservation and restoration of seagrasses in the United States and adjacent*
766 *waters* (noaa:1672). <https://repository.library.noaa.gov/view/noaa/1672>
- 767 Furman, B. T., Merello, M., Shea, C. P., Kenworthy, W. J., & Hall, M. O. (2019).
768 Monitoring of physically restored seagrass meadows reveals a slow rate of
769 recovery for *Thalassia testudinum*. *Restoration Ecology*, 27(2), 421–430.
770 <https://doi.org/10.1111/rec.12877>
- 771 Ghosh, S., Lobanov, S., & Lo, V. K. (~~2019a~~2019). An overview of technologies to
772 recover phosphorus as struvite from wastewater: Advantages and shortcomings.
773 *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 26(19), 19063–19077.

Formatted: Font: Italic





- 774 ~~Ghosh, S., Lobanov, S., & Lo, V. K. (2019b). An overview of technologies to recover~~
775 ~~phosphorus as struvite from wastewater: Advantages and shortcomings.~~
776 ~~*Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 26(19), 19063–19077.~~
777 ~~<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-019-05378-6>~~
- 778 ~~Gras, A. F., Koch, M. S., & Madden, C. J. (2003). Phosphorus uptake kinetics of a~~
779 ~~dominant tropical seagrass *Thalassia testudinum*. *Aquatic Botany*, 76(4), 299–~~
780 ~~315. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3770\(03\)00069-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3770(03)00069-X)~~
- 781 Hall, M. O., Merello, M., Kenworthy, W. J., Berns, D., Ferenc, K., Kunzelman, J., Hall,
782 F., & Hyniova, J. (2006). *Developing Techniques to Enhance the Recovery Rates*
783 *of Propeller Scars in Turtlegrass (*Thalassia testudinum*) Meadows*. USFWS.
- 784 ~~Hammerstrom, K., Sheridan, P., & McMahan, C. (1998). Potential for seagrass~~
785 ~~restoration in Galveston Bay, Texas. *Texas Journal of Science*, 50, 35–50.~~
- 786 Heck, K., Fodrie, F., Madsen, S., Baillie, C., & Byron, D. (2015). Seagrass consumption
787 by native and a tropically associated fish species: Potential impacts of the
788 tropicalization of the northern Gulf of Mexico. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*,
789 520, 165–173. <https://doi.org/10.3354/meps11104>
- 790 Herbeck, L. S., Sollich, M., Unger, D., Holmer, M., & Jennerjahn, T. C. (2014). Impact of
791 pond aquaculture effluents on seagrass performance in NE Hainan, tropical
792 China. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 85(1), 190–203.
793 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2014.05.050>
- 794 Herbert, D. A., & Fourqurean, J. W. (2008). Ecosystem ~~Structure~~structure and ~~Function~~
795 ~~Still Altered Two Decades After Short-Term Fertilization~~function still altered two

796 [decades after short-term fertilization](#) of a ~~Seagrass Meadow~~[seagrass meadow](#).
797 *Ecosystems*, 11(5), 688–700. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10021-008-9151-2>

798 Hill, J. M., & Heck, K. L. (2015). Non-consumptive effects of avian predators on fish
799 behavior and cascading indirect interactions in seagrasses. *Oikos*, 124(6), 750–
800 761. <https://doi.org/10.1111/oik.01774>

801 Holmes, P. M. (2001). Shrubland ~~Restoration Following Woody Alien~~
802 ~~Invasion~~[restoration following woody alien invasion](#) and ~~Mining~~[mining](#): Effects of
803 ~~Topsoil Depth, Seed Source~~[topsoil depth, seed source](#), and ~~Fertilizer~~
804 ~~Addition~~[fertilizer addition](#). *Restoration Ecology*, 9(1), 71–84.
805 <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1526-100x.2001.009001071.x>

806 ~~Irick, D. L., Gu, B., Li, Y. C., Inglett, P. W., Frederick, P. C., Ross, M. S., Wright, A. L., &~~
807 ~~Ewe, S. M. L. (2015). Wading bird guano enrichment of soil nutrients in tree~~
808 ~~islands of the Florida Everglades. The Science of the Total Environment, 532,~~
809 ~~40–47. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2015.05.097~~

810 Jaquetti, R. K., Gonçalves, J. F. de C., Ferraz, J. B. S., Ferreira, M. J., Junior, U. M. dos
811 S., & Lacerda, C. F. de. (2014). Green ~~Fertilization Enhances~~[fertilization](#)
812 ~~enhances~~ the ~~Photosynthetic Performance~~[photosynthetic performance](#) and the
813 ~~Growth~~[growth](#) of ~~Leguminous Trees~~[leguminous trees](#) for ~~Restoration~~
814 ~~Plantation~~[restoration plantation](#) in Central Amazon. *American Journal of Plant*
815 *Sciences*, 2014. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ajps.2014.516264>

816 Kassambara, A., & Mundt, F. (2017). Factoextra: Extract and visualize the results of
817 multivariate data analyses. *R Package Version*, 1(5), 337–354.



818 Kenworthy, J. W., & Fonseca, M. S. (1992). The use of fertilizer to enhance growth of
819 transplanted seagrasses *Zostera marina* L. and *Halodule wrightii* Aschers.
820 *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, 163(2), 141–161.
821 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0981\(92\)90045-C](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0981(92)90045-C)

822 Kenworthy, W. J., Hall, M. O., Hammerstrom, K. K., Merello, M., & Schwartzschild, A.
823 (2018). Restoration of tropical seagrass beds using wild bird fertilization and
824 sediment regrading. *Ecological Engineering*, 112, 72–81.
825 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoleng.2017.12.008>

826 ~~Kumar, R., & Pal, P. (2015). Assessing the feasibility of N and P recovery by struvite
827 precipitation from nutrient rich wastewater: A review. *Environmental Science and
828 Pollution Research International*, 22(22), 17453–17464.
829 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-015-5450-2>~~

830 Lee, J. E., Rahman, M. M., & Ra, C. S. (2009). Dose effects of Mg and PO₄ sources on
831 the composting of swine manure. *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, 169(1), 801–
832 807. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2009.04.026>

833 ~~Li, M., Lundquist, C. J., Pilditch, C. A., Rees, T. a. V., & Ellis, J. (2019). Implications of
834 nutrient enrichment for the conservation and management of seagrass *Zostera
835 muelleri* meadows. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems*,
836 29(9), 1484–1502. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.3141>~~

837 Liao, X., Nair, V. D., Canon, A., Dobberfuhr, D. R., Foster, D. K., & Inglett, P. W. (2019).
838 Subsurface transport and potential risk of phosphorus to groundwater across
839 different land uses in a karst springs basin, Florida, USA. *Geoderma*, 338, 97–
840 106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2018.11.005>

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

841 [MacDonnell, C., Tiling, K., Encomio, V., van der Heide, T., Teunis, M., Lengkeek, W.,](#)
 842 [Didderen, K., Bouma, T. J., & Inglett, K. S. \(2016\). Seasonal patterns of nitrogen](#)
 843 [cycling in P. W. \(2022\). Evaluating a novel biodegradable lattice structure for](#)
 844 [subtropical short hydroperiod wetlands: Effects of precipitation and seagrass](#)
 845 [restoration. *Science of The Total Environment*, 556, 136–145. *Aquatic Botany*,](#)
 846 [176, 103463. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.02.203>](#)

847 [Martí, N., Pastor, L., Bouzas, A., Ferrer, J., & Seco, A. \(2010\). Phosphorus recovery by](#)
 848 [struvite crystallization in WWTPs: Influence of the sludge treatment line](#)
 849 [operation. *Water Research*, 44\(7\), 2371–2379.](#)
 850 [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2009.12.043 *aquabot.2021.103463*](#)

851 Mayer, B. K., Baker, L. A., Boyer, T. H., Drechsel, P., Gifford, M., Hanjra, M. A.,
 852 Parameswaran, P., Stoltzfus, J., Westerhoff, P., & Rittmann, B. E. (2016). Total
 853 value of phosphorus recovery. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 50(13),
 854 6606–6620. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.6b01239>

855 NC State. (2018). *North Carolina Extension Gardener Handbook*. NC State.
 856 <https://content.ces.ncsu.edu/extension-gardener-handbook>

857 Nedelciu, C. E., Ragnarsdottir, K. V., Schlyter, P., & Stjernquist, I. (2020). Global
 858 phosphorus supply chain dynamics: Assessing regional impact to 2050. *Global*
 859 *Food Security*, 26, 100426.

860 Nevins, C. J., Strauss, S. L., & Inglett, P. W. (2020). Biological soil crusts enhance
 861 moisture and nutrients in the upper rooting zone of sandy soil agroecosystems.
 862 *Journal of Plant Nutrition and Soil Science*, 183(5), 615–626.
 863 <https://doi.org/10.1002/jpln.202000218>

864 Olsen, Y. S., & Valiela, I. (2010). Effect of Sediment-Nutrient Enrichment
865 sediment nutrient enrichment and Grazing on Turtle Grass turtle grass, *Thalassia*
866 *testudinum* in Jobos Bay, Puerto Rico. *Estuaries and Coasts*, 33(3), 769–783.
867 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12237-009-9256-7>

Formatted: Font: Italic

868 Peralta, G., Bouma, T., Soelen, J., Pérez-Lloréns, J., & Hernández, I. (2003). On the
869 use of sediment fertilization for seagrass restoration: A mesocosm study on
870 *Zostera marina* L. *Aquatic Botany*, 75, 95–110. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3770(02)00168-7)
871 [3770\(02\)00168-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3770(02)00168-7)

872 Pereda-Briones, L., Tomas, F., & Terrados, J. (2018). Field transplantation of seagrass
873 (Posidonia oceanica) seedlings: Effects of invasive algae and nutrients. Marine
874 Pollution Bulletin, 134, 160–165. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2017.09.034

875 Powell, G., Kenworthy, W., & Fourqurean, J. (1989). Experimental evidence for nutrient
876 limitation of seagrass growth in a tropical estuary with restricted circulation.
877 Undefined./paper/Experimental-evidence-for-nutrient-limitation-of-in-Powell-
878 Kenworthy/5152405fa8e8d33240c6b33420bf32c063c07f2b

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

879 Rahman, Md. M., Salleh, M. A. Mohd., Rashid, U., Ahsan, A., Hossain, M. M., & Ra, C.
880 S. (2014). Production of slow release crystal fertilizer from wastewaters through
881 struvite crystallization – A review. *Arabian Journal of Chemistry*, 7(1), 139–155.
882 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arabjc.2013.10.007>

883 Reed, S. C., Seastedt, T. R., Mann, C. M., Suding, K. N., Townsend, A. R., & Cherwin,
884 K. L. (2007). Phosphorus fertilization stimulates nitrogen fixation and increases
885 inorganic nitrogen concentrations in a restored prairie. *Applied Soil Ecology*,
886 [36\(2\)](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsoil.2007.02.002), 238–242. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsoil.2007.02.002>



- 887 Rezek, R., Furman, B., Jung, R., Hall, M., & Bell, S. (2019). Long-term performance of
888 seagrass restoration projects in Florida, USA. *Scientific Reports*, 9.
889 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-51856-9>
- 890 ~~Robertson, G. P., & Vitousek, P. M. (2009). Nitrogen in Agriculture: Balancing the Cost
891 of an Essential Resource. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 34(1),
892 97–125. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.enviro.032108.105046>~~
- 893 Robles-Aguilar, A. A., Pang, J., Postma, J. A., Schrey, S. D., Lambers, H., &
894 Jablonowski, N. D. (2019). The effect of pH on morphological and physiological
895 root traits of *Lupinus angustifolius* treated with struvite as a recycled phosphorus
896 source. *Plant and Soil*, 434(1), 65–78. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-018-3787-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-018-3787-2)
897 2
- 898 Rufi-Salís, M., Brunnhofer, N., Petit-Boix, A., Gabarrell, X., Guisasola, A., & Villalba, G.
899 (2020). Can wastewater feed cities? Determining the feasibility and
900 environmental burdens of struvite recovery and reuse for urban regions. *Science*
901 *of The Total Environment*, 737, 139783.
- 902 Schönau, A., & Herbert, M. (1983). Relationship between growth rate, fertilizing and
903 foliar nutrient concentrations for *Eucalyptus grandis*; preliminary investigations.
904 *Fertilizer Research*, 4(4), 369–380. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01054010>
- 905 Sheridan, P., McMahan, G., Hammerstrom, K., & Jr, W. P. (1998). Factors affecting
906 restoration of *Halodule wrightii* to Galveston Bay, Texas. *Restoration Ecology*,
907 6(2), 144–158. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1526-100X.1998.00625.x>
- 908 Short, F., & Coles, R. G. (2001). *Global Seagrass Research Methods*. Elsevier.
909 <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-444-50891-1.X5000-2>

- 910 Statton, J., Kendrick, G. A., Dixon, K. W., & Cambridge, M. L. (2014). Inorganic ~~Nutrient~~
 911 ~~Supplements Constrain Restoration Potential~~ *Nutrient supplements constrain*
 912 ~~restoration potential~~ of ~~Seedlings~~ *seedlings* of the ~~Seagrass~~ *seagrass*, *Posidonia*
 913 *australis*. *Restoration Ecology*, 22(2), 196–203. <https://doi.org/10.1111/rec.12072>
- 914 Talboys, P. J., Heppell, J., Roose, T., Healey, J. R., Jones, D. L., & Withers, P. J. A.
 915 (2016). Struvite: A slow-release fertiliser for sustainable phosphorus
 916 management? *Plant and Soil*, 401(1), 109–123. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-015-2747-3)
 917 [015-2747-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-015-2747-3)
- 918 Tanner, C. E., & Parham, T. (2010). Growing *Zostera marina* (eelgrass) from seeds in
 919 land-based culture systems for use in restoration projects. *Restoration Ecology*,
 920 18(4), 527–537. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1526-100X.2010.00693.x>
- 921 ~~Temmink, R. J. M., Christianen, M. J. A., Fivash, G. S., Angelini, C., Boström, C.,~~
 922 ~~Didderen, K., Engel, S. M., Esteban, N., Gaeckle, J. L., Gagnon, K., Govers, L.~~
 923 ~~L., Infantes, E., van Katwijk, M. M., Kipson, S., Lamers, L. P. M., Lengkeek, W.,~~
 924 ~~Silliman, B. R., van Tussenbroek, B. I., Unsworth, R. K. F., ... van der Heide, T.~~
 925 ~~(2020). Mimicry of emergent traits amplifies coastal restoration success. *Nature*~~
 926 ~~*Communications*, 11(1), 3668. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-17438-4>~~
- 927 Thomsen, M. S., Wernberg, T., Engelen, A. H., Tuya, F., Vanderklift, M. A., Holmer, M.,
 928 McGlathery, K. J., Arenas, F., Kotta, J., & Silliman, B. R. (2012). A meta-analysis
 929 of seaweed impacts on seagrasses: Generalities and knowledge gaps. *PLoS*
 930 *ONE*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0028595>
- 931 ~~Tootonchi, M., Bhadha, J. H., Lang, T. A., McCray, J. M., Clark, M. W., & Daroub, S.~~
 932 ~~H. (2018). Reducing drainage water phosphorus concentration with rice~~

Formatted: Font: Italic

933 cultivation under different water management regimes. *Agricultural Water*
934 *Management*, 205, 30–37. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2018.04.036>

935 Tuya, F., Vila, F., Bergasa, O., Zarranz, M., Espino, F., & Robaina, R. R. (2017).
936 Artificial seagrass leaves shield transplanted seagrass seedlings and increase
937 their survivorship. *Aquatic Botany*, 136, 31–34.
938 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquabot.2016.09.001>

939 USEPA. (1974). *Organic Carbon, Total (Combustion or Oxidation). Method 415.1*. U.S.
940 Environmental Protection Agency.

941 USEPA. (1993). *Method 365.1, Revision 2.0: Determination of Phosphorus by Semi-*
942 *Automated Colorimetry*. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.


943 van der Heide, T., Smolders, A. J. P., Rijkens, B. G. A., van Nes, E. H., van Katwijk, M.
944 M., & Roelofs, J. G. M. (2008). Toxicity of reduced nitrogen in eelgrass (*Zostera*
945 *marina*) is highly dependent on shoot density and pH. *Oecologia*, 158(3), 411–
946 419. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-008-1155-2>


947 Wang, L., Tomas, F., & Mueller, R. S. (2020). Nutrient enrichment increases size of
948 *Zostera marina* shoots and enriches for sulfur and nitrogen cycling bacteria in
949 root-associated microbiomes. *FEMS Microbiology Ecology*, 96(8).
950 <https://doi.org/10.1093/femsec/fiaa129>

951 Ye, Y., Ngo, H. H., Guo, W., Chang, S. W., Nguyen, D. D., Zhang, X., Zhang, J., &
952 Liang, S. (2020). Nutrient recovery from wastewater: From technology to
953 economy. *Bioresource Technology Reports*, 100425.

954 Zedler, J. B. (2000). Progress in wetland restoration ecology. *Trends in Ecology &*
955 *Evolution*, 15(10), 402–407. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347\(00\)01959-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347(00)01959-5)








957 Figure 1. Porewater total dissolved phosphorus (TDP) (A), and seagrass shoot count
 958 (B) taken during the first mesocosm experiment. The treatments were labelled
 959 Seagrass (for the unfertilized seagrass plots), Seagrass-Osmocote™ (for planted plots
 960 fertilized with Osmocote™), and Seagrass-Struv (planted plots fertilized with struvite).
 961

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", First line: 0", Space After: 0 pt, Line spacing: Double


962 The asterisks designate significant differences between treatments for the same sample
 963 dates. Points represent the mean of six replicates (\pm SE).



964
 965 Figure 2. Shoot count (A) and blade length (B) from the second mesocosm experiment.
 966 The treatments were labelled Seagrass (unfertilized seagrass plots), Seagrass-Osmo-
 967 Lo and Seagrass-Osmo-Med (planted plots fertilized with Osmocote™), Seagrass-
 968 Struv-Lo, Seagrass-Struv-Med, and Seagrass-Struv-Hi (planted plots fertilized with
 969 struvite). *: Five shoots were added to each plot to match the first/single dose


Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", First line: 0", Space After: 0 pt, Line spacing: Double

970 experiment. Letters designate significant differences between treatments for the same
 971 sample dates. Points represent the mean of four replicates (\pm SE), except for above-
 972 ground biomass, which had two to four replicates.



973 Figure 3. Above and belowground biomass from the second mesocosm experiment.
 974 The treatments were labelled Seagrass (unfertilized seagrass plots), Seagrass-Osmo-
 975 Lo and Seagrass-Osmo-Med (planted plots fertilized with Osmocote™), Seagrass-
 976 Struv-Lo, Seagrass-Struv-Med, and Seagrass-Struv-Hi (planted plots fertilized with
 977 struvite). Letters designate significant differences between treatments for the same
 978 sample dates. Points represent the mean of four replicates (\pm SE), except for above-
 979 ground biomass, which had two to four replicates.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", First line: 0", Space After: 0 pt, Line spacing: Double



983 **Figure 4. Clustering results of treatment methods from the second experiment.** No
 984 overlapping clusters were formed, indicating a significantly different global effect of
 985 struvite onto the water chemistry and plant growth characteristics compared to
 986 Osmocote™ treatment or control plot. Seagrass aboveground metrics (shoot count, blade
 987 length and aboveground biomass) were heavily correlated ($r > 95\%$, $p < 0.001$) with first
 988 principal component which explained 52.5% of the variance in the dataset. Porewater
 989 nutrient dynamics such as TDN and TDP were most correlated ($p < 0.05$) and contributing
 990 to second principal component which explained 32.4% of the variance in the dataset. The
 991 treatments were labelled Seagrass (unfertilized seagrass plots), Seagrass-Osmo-Lo and
 992 Seagrass-Osmo-Med (planted plots fertilized with Osmocote™), Seagrass-Struv-Lo,
 993 Seagrass-Struv-Med, and Seagrass-Struv-Hi (planted plots fertilized with struvite).

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", First line: 0", Space After: 0 pt, Line spacing: Double

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

995 Table S-1. Two-way linear mixed effects test results for shoot count and TDP from the
 996 single dose experiment/Experiment #1. Factors include treatment, date sampled, and
 997 the interaction between these factors.

Source	Variable					
	Shoot			TDP		
Parameter	DF	F statistic	P value	DF	F statistic	P value
Treatment	2	35.91	< 0.0001	5	246.7	< 0.0001
Date	7	10.07	< 0.0001	2	19.50	< 0.0001
Treatment x Date	14	27.95	< 0.0001	10	2.201	0.0328

998

999

1000

1001

1002

1003

1004

1005

1006

1007

1008

1009

1010

1

1012 Table S-2. Two-way linear mixed effects test results for seagrass metrics and
 1013 porewater nutrients from the multi-dose experiment/Experiment #2. Factors include
 1014 treatment, date sampled, and the interaction between these factors.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", First line: 0", Line spacing: Double

Formatted: Width: 8.5", Height: 11"

Source	Variable											
	Shoot			Length			TDN			TDP		
Parameter	-----count-----			-----cm-----			-----mg L ⁻¹ -----					
	DF	F statistic	P value	DF	F statistic	P value	DF	F statistic	P value	DF	F statistic	P value
Type	5	0.5703	0.7219	5	13.57	< 0.0001	8	22.37	< 0.0001	8	42.30	< 0.0001
Date	6	18.83	< 0.0001	3	83.75	< 0.0001	2	1.820	0.1686	3	128.2	< 0.0001
Type x Date	30	1.683	0.0289	15	2.118	0.0265	16	1.106	0.3636	24	6.341	< 0.0001

Formatted Table

1015



1016 Table S-3. Linear mixed effects test table for biomass taken at the end of the multi-
 1017 dose experiment/Experiment #2.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", First line: 0", Line spacing: Double

Variable						
Aboveground Biomass				Belowground Biomass		
Source	-----g-----					
Parameter	DF	F statistic	P value	DF	F statistic	P value
Type	4	5.231	0.0077	4	4.560	0.0131

1018
 1019
 1020
 1021
 1022
 1023
 1024
 1025
 1026
 1027
 1028
 1029
 1030
 1031
 1032
 1033
 1034

1035 Table S-4. Linear mixed effects test table for tissue nutrients (percent weight) taken at the end of the multi-dose
 1036 experiment/Experiment #2.

Variable												
Aboveground %TN				Aboveground %TP			Belowground %TN			Belowground %TP		
Source	-----Percent-----											
Parameter	DF	F statistic	P value	DF	F statistic	P value	DF	F statistic	P value	DF	F statistic	P value
Type	4	0.784	0.560	3	0.583	0.639	4	3.072	0.049	4	0.539	0.709

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", First line: 0", Line spacing: Double

Formatted Table

Formatted Table



1037

1038 Table S-5. Linear mixed effects test table for tissue nutrient mass (biomass x % nutrients) taken at the end of the multi-
 1039 dose experiment/Experiment #2. Combined weights present the aboveground TN and TP weights were removed for the
 1040 analysis (n=2 for Osmocote™ treatments, unfertilized seagrass removed). Belowground weights for both TN and TP did
 1041 not have combined samples.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", First line: 0", Line spacing: Double

Variable													
Aboveground TN Mass				Aboveground TP Mass			Belowground TN Mass			Belowground TP Mass			
Source	-----g-----												
Parameter	DF	F statistic	P value	DF	F statistic	P value	DF	F statistic	P value	DF	F statistic	P value	P value
Type	3	1.619	0.2370	3	2.524	0.1070	4	3.276	0.0406	4	3.705	0.0273	

1042



1043



1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1070
1071

Table S-6. Mean sediment TC/TN values taken at the end of the multi-dose experiment/Experiment #2. The treatments were labelled control (unfertilized, unplanted plots), Osmo (unplanted fertilized with Osmocote), Struv (unplanted fertilized with struvite), S-Control (unfertilized seagrass plots), S-Osmo-Lo and S-Osmo-Med (planted plots fertilized with Osmocote), S-Struv-Lo, S-Struv-Med, and S-Struv-Hi (planted plots fertilized with struvite).

Variable	TC		TN	
	Mean	SE	Mean	SE
Treatment	-----mg/kg-----			
Control	52.55 ^{NS}	2.22	2.058 ^{NS}	0.009
Control-Osmo	57.55 ^{NS}	2.24	2.073 ^{NS}	0.015

<u>Control-Struv</u>	<u>53.53^{NS}</u>	<u>6.73</u>	<u>2.036^{NS}</u>	<u>0.016</u>
<u>Seagrass</u>	<u>52.09^{NS}</u>	<u>4.33</u>	<u>2.020^{NS}</u>	<u>0.032</u>
<u>Seagrass-Osmo-Lo</u>	<u>50.56^{NS}</u>	<u>3.28</u>	<u>2.0259^{NS}</u>	<u>0.005</u>
<u>Seagrass-Osmo-Med</u>	<u>49.46^{NS}</u>	<u>3.56</u>	<u>2.053^{NS}</u>	<u>0.027</u>
<u>Seagrass-Struv-Lo</u>	<u>52.02^{NS}</u>	<u>6.17</u>	<u>2.057^{NS}</u>	<u>0.027</u>
<u>Seagrass-Struv-Med</u>	<u>48.70^{NS}</u>	<u>5.02</u>	<u>2.023^{NS}</u>	<u>0.026</u>
<u>Seagrass-Struv-Hi</u>	<u>58.16^{NS}</u>	<u>5.63</u>	<u>2.096^{NS}</u>	<u>0.02</u>

1077

1078

1079

1080

1081

1082

1083

1084

1085

1086

1087

1088

1089

1090

1091

1092

1093

1094

Table S-7. Mixed effects test table for sediment TC/TN taken at the end of the multi-dose experiment/Experiment #2.

Source	Variable					
	TC			TN		
Parameter	DF	F statistic	P value	DF	F statistic	P value
Treatment	8	0.5028	0.8435	8	1.376	0.2514

1096

1097

1098

1099

10





1101
 1102
 1103
 1104
 1105
 1106
 1107
 1108
 1109
 1110
 1111
 1112
 1113
 1114
 1115
 1116
 1117
 1118
 1119
 1120
 1121
 1122

Table S-8. Figure 1. Porewater total dissolved phosphorus (TDP) (A), and seagrass shoot count (B) taken during the first mesocosm experiment. The treatments were labelled Seagrass (for the unfertilized seagrass plots), Seagrass Osmocote™ (for planted plots fertilized with Osmocote™), and Seagrass Struv (planted plots fertilized with struvite). The asterisks designate significant differences between treatments for the same sample dates. Points represent the mean of six replicates (\pm SE).

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", First line: 0", Space After: 0 pt, Line spacing: Double






1123 **Figure 2.** Shoot count (A) and blade length (B) from the second mesocosm experiment.
 1124 The treatments were labelled Seagrass (unfertilized seagrass plots), Seagrass Osmo-
 1125 Lo and Seagrass Osmo Med (planted plots fertilized with Osmocote™), Seagrass-
 1126 Struv Lo, Seagrass Struv Med, and Seagrass Struv Hi (planted plots fertilized with
 1127 struvite). *: Five shoots were added to each plot to match the first/single dose
 1128 experiment. Letters designate significant differences between treatments for the same

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", First line: 0", Space After: 0 pt, Line spacing: Double




1130 sample dates. Points represent the mean of four replicates (\pm SE), except for above-
 1131 ground biomass, which had two to four replicates.
 1132



1133 **Figure 3.** Above and belowground biomass from the second mesocosm experiment.
 1134 The treatments were labelled Seagrass (unfertilized seagrass plots), Seagrass Osmo-
 1135 Lo and Seagrass Osmo Med (planted plots fertilized with Osmocote™), Seagrass
 1136 Struv Lo, Seagrass Struv Med, and Seagrass Struv Hi (planted plots fertilized with
 1137 etruvite). Letters designate significant differences between treatments for the same
 1138 sample dates. Points represent the mean of four replicates (\pm SE), except for above-
 1139 ground biomass, which had two to four replicates.
 1140
 1141
 1142

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", First line: 0", Space After: 0 pt, Line spacing: Double



1143

1144 ~~Figure 4. Clustering results of treatment methods from the second experiment. No~~

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", First line: 0", Space After: 0 pt, Line spacing: Double

1145 ~~overlapping clusters were formed, indicating a significantly different global effect of~~

1146 ~~struvite onto the water chemistry and plant growth characteristics compared to~~

1147 ~~Osmocote™ treatment or control plot. The treatments were labelled Seagrass~~

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

1148 ~~(unfertilized seagrass plots), Seagrass Osmo Lo and Seagrass Osmo Med (planted plots~~

1149 ~~fertilized with Osmocote™), Seagrass Struv Lo, Seagrass Struv Med, and Seagrass~~

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

1150 ~~Struv Hi (planted plots fertilized with struvite).~~

1151

1152

1153

1154

1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166

Table S-4. Mean porewater nutrient measurements from the second experiment. The treatments were labelled Control (unfertilized, unplanted plots), Control-Osmo (unplanted fertilized with Osmocote™), Control-Struv (unplanted fertilized with struvite), Seagrass (unfertilized seagrass plots), Seagrass-Osmo-Lo and Seagrass-Osmo-Med (planted plots fertilized with Osmocote™), Seagrass-Struv-Lo, Seagrass-Struv-Med, and Seagrass-Struv-Hi (planted plots fertilized with struvite). Only TDP was analyzed for Day 31, therefore TDN values at that date are designated “NA.” Letters within biomass type represent a significantly different mean based on linear mixed model analyses (NS= not significant).

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", First line: 0", Line spacing: Double

Variable		TDN		TDP	
Days after Deployment	Treatment	Mean	SE	Mean	SE
6	Control	1.51 ^{NS}	0.38	0.128 ^D	0.004
	Control-Osmo	12.03 ^{NS}	5.16	9.640 ^{AB}	3.685
	Control-Struv	4.35 ^{NS}	1.52	2.093 ^C	0.276
	Seagrass	1.41 ^{NS}	0.45	0.182 ^D	0.021
	Seagrass-Osmo-Lo	7.89 ^{NS}	4.34	4.750 ^{BC}	1.169
	Seagrass-Osmo-Med	26.8 ^{NS}	7.53	17.68 ^A	6.738
	Seagrass-Struv-Lo	4.33 ^{NS}	1.60	2.795 ^C	0.962
	Seagrass-Struv-Med	3.32 ^{NS}	0.88	1.943 ^C	0.211
	Seagrass-Struv-Hi	4.79 ^{NS}	0.86	2.620 ^C	0.351
20	Control	1.10 ^{NS}	0.16	0.133 ^C	0.010
	Control-Osmo	19.8 ^{NS}	2.14	0.508 ^A	0.102
	Control-Struv	5.59 ^{NS}	1.91	0.303 ^{ABC}	0.138
	Seagrass	0.78 ^{NS}	0.14	0.134 ^C	0.016
	Seagrass-Osmo-Lo	6.20 ^{NS}	2.33	0.289 ^{ABC}	0.094
	Seagrass-Osmo-Med	12.02 ^{NS}	0.82	0.472 ^{AB}	0.279

- Formatted:** Font color: Black
- Formatted Table**
- Formatted:** Font color: Black
- Formatted:** Font color: Black
- Formatted:** Font color: Black
- Formatted:** Font: Calibri, Font color: Black
- Formatted:** Font: Calibri, Font color: Black
- Formatted:** Font color: Black
- Formatted:** Font color: Black
- Formatted:** Font color: Black
- Formatted:** Font color: Black
- Formatted:** Font color: Black
- Formatted:** Font color: Black
- Formatted:** Font color: Black
- Formatted:** Font color: Black
- Formatted:** Font color: Black
- Formatted:** Font color: Black
- Formatted:** Font color: Black
- Formatted:** Font color: Black
- Formatted:** Font color: Black

1167
1168

Seagrass-Struv-Lo	2.47 ^{NS}	0.42	0.272 ^{ABC}	0.107
Seagrass-Struv-Med	2.58 ^{NS}	0.80	0.187 ^{BC}	0.021
Seagrass-Struv-Hi	6.81 ^{NS}	1.73	0.322 ^{ABC}	0.113

- Formatted: Font color: Black
- Formatted: Font color: Black
- Formatted: Font color: Black

Table S.8. Continued.

Variable		TDN		TDP	
Days after Deployment	Treatment	Mean	SE	Mean	SE
-----mg/L-----					
31	Control	NA	NA	0.110 ^D	0.009
	Control-Osmo	NA	NA	2.455 ^{BC}	0.560
	Control-Struv	NA	NA	2.923 ^{ABC}	0.966
	Seagrass	NA	NA	0.114 ^D	0.016
	Seagrass-Osmo-Lo	NA	NA	1.47 ^C	0.375
	Seagrass-Osmo-Med	NA	NA	9.733 ^{AB}	6.667
	Seagrass-Struv-Lo	NA	NA	0.163 ^D	0.038
	Seagrass-Struv-Med	NA	NA	1.353 ^C	0.166

- Formatted: Normal
- Formatted: Font color: Black
- Formatted: Font color: Black
- Formatted: Font color: Black
- Formatted: Font color: Black
- Formatted: Font color: Black
- Formatted: Font color: Black
- Formatted: Font color: Black
- Formatted: Font color: Black

1169
1170

Table S.1. Continued.

Variable		TDN		TDP	
Days after Deployment	Treatment	Mean	SE	Mean	SE
-----mg L ⁻¹ -----					
-	Seagrass-Struv-Hi	NA	NA	8.220 ^A	3.634
74	Control	1.97 ^{NS}	0.19	0.085 ^C	0.007
	Control-Osmo	12.2 ^{NS}	7.54	0.488 ^A	0.135
	Control-Struv	7.75 ^{NS}	2.00	0.159 ^{BC}	0.054
	Seagrass	1.68 ^{NS}	0.15	0.084 ^C	0.021
	Seagrass-Osmo-Lo	5.39 ^{NS}	0.54	0.261 ^{AB}	0.067
	Seagrass-Osmo-Med	17.3 ^{NS}	4.98	0.551 ^A	0.105
	Seagrass-Struv-Lo	4.04 ^{NS}	1.23	0.162 ^{BC}	0.064
	Seagrass-Struv-Med	4.74 ^{NS}	1.03	0.143 ^{BC}	0.023
	Seagrass-Struv-Hi	9.32 ^{NS}	1.62	0.156 ^{BC}	0.017

- Formatted: Normal
- Formatted: Font color: Black
- Formatted: Font color: Black
- Formatted: Font color: Black
- Formatted: Font color: Black
- Formatted: Font color: Black
- Formatted: Font color: Black
- Formatted: Font color: Black
- Formatted: Font color: Black
- Formatted: Font color: Black
- Formatted: Font color: Black

1171
1172

1173
1174
1175
1176
1177
1178
1179
1180
1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1189
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1200

Table S-29. Mean percent tissue nutrient content and ratio taken at the end of the second experiment. The treatments were labelled Seagrass (unfertilized seagrass plots), Seagrass-Osmo-Lo and Seagrass-Osmo-Med (planted plots fertilized with Osmocote™), Seagrass-Struv-Lo, Seagrass-Struv-Med, and Seagrass-Struv-Hi (planted plots fertilized with struvite). Combined weights present the aboveground TN and TP weights were removed for the analysis (n= 2 for Osmocote™ treatments, unfertilized seagrass removed). Belowground weights for both TN and TP did not have combined samples. Letters within biomass type represent a significantly different mean based on linear mixed model analyses (NS= not significant).

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", First line: 0", Line spacing: Double

Biomass Type	Treatment	TN		TP		TN:TP	
		Mean	SE	Mean	SE	Mean	SE
		-----Percent-----				Wt/Wt Ratio	
Above-ground	Seagrass	1.90 ^{NS}	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Seagrass-Osmo-Lo	2.14 ^{NS}	0.11	0.258 ^{NS}	0.016	8.33 ^{NS}	0.57
	Seagrass-Osmo-Med	2.08 ^{NS}	0.11	0.249 ^{NS}	0.017	8.47 ^{NS}	0.88
	Seagrass-Struv-Lo	2.34 ^{NS}	0.23	0.236 ^{NS}	0.007	10.01 ^{NS}	1.20
	Seagrass-Struv-Med	2.31 ^{NS}	0.14	0.246 ^{NS}	0.010	9.38 ^{NS}	0.29



	Seagrass-Struv-Hi	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Below-ground	Seagrass	0.65 ^{AB}	0.06	0.166 ^{NS}	0.018	3.90 ^{NS}	0.36
	Seagrass-Osmo-Lo	0.53 ^B	0.07	0.154 ^{NS}	0.009	3.44 ^{NS}	0.47
	Seagrass-Osmo-Med	0.84 ^A	0.06	0.179 ^{NS}	0.008	4.71 ^{NS}	0.36
	Seagrass-Struv-Lo	0.66 ^{AB}	0.05	0.168 ^{NS}	0.011	3.94 ^{NS}	0.29
	Seagrass-Struv-Med	0.71 ^{AB}	0.07	0.164 ^{NS}	0.011	4.32 ^{NS}	0.45
	Seagrass-Struv-Hi	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA


1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207



1208
1209 Figure S-1. Image showing an example of the differences in above and belowground
1210 biomass in seagrasses from the first experiment. Observable stunted roots (possibly
1211 root burn) are visible in the Osmocote™ treated plots (SP) versus the control (S) and
1212 struvite treated plots (SS).

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Line spacing: Double





Highlights:

Seagrass restoration is currently expensive and often unsuccessful.

Fertilizers improve restoration but can release excess nutrients.

Osmocote™ and struvite fertilizers were investigated for plant and nutrient metrics.

Struvite produced higher seagrass metrics and released less nutrients.

1 **Abstract**

2 Seagrasses are in decline worldwide, and their restoration is relatively expensive and
3 unsuccessful compared to other coastal systems. Fertilization can improve seagrass
4 growth in restoration but can also release nutrients and pollute the surrounding
5 ecosystem. A slow-release fertilizer may reduce excessive nutrient discharge while still
6 providing resources to the seagrass's rhizosphere. In this study, struvite (magnesium
7 ammonium phosphate), a relatively insoluble, sustainable compound harvested in
8 wastewater treatment plants, was compared to Osmocote™ (14:14:14 Nitrogen:
9 Phosphorus: Potassium, N:P:K), a popular polymer coated controlled release fertilizer
10 commonly used in seagrass restoration. Two experiments compared the effectiveness
11 of both fertilizers in a subtropical flow-through mesocosm setup. In the first experiment,
12 single 0.5 mg of P per g dry weight (DW) doses of Osmocote™ and struvite fertilizers
13 were added to seagrass plots. Seagrass shoot counts were significantly higher in plots
14 fertilized with struvite than both the Osmocote™ and unfertilized controls ($p < 0.0001$).
15 A significant difference in total P concentrations was observed in porewater samples of
16 Osmocote™ vs struvite and controls ($p < 0.0001$), with struvite fertilized plots emitting
17 more than controls ($p \leq 0.0001$), but less than 2% of the total dissolved P (TDP) of
18 Osmocote™ fertilized plots (100+ mg/L versus $x > 5$ mg/L). A subsequent experiment,
19 using smaller doses (0.01 and 0.025 mg of P per gram DW added), also found that the
20 struvite treatments performed better than Osmocote™, with 16-114% more
21 aboveground biomass (10-60% higher total biomass) while releasing less N and P.
22 These results indicate the relatively rapid dissolution of Osmocote™ may pose
23 problems to restoration efforts, especially in concentrated doses and possibly leading to

24 seagrass stress. In contrast, struvite may function as a slow-release fertilizer applicable
25 in seagrass and other coastal restoration efforts.

26 **Keywords:** *Halodule wrightii*; seagrass; marine restoration; fertilizer; struvite;
27 Osmocote™; phosphorus

28 **1. Introduction**

29 In many environments, restoration is improved by fertilization, lessening nutrient
30 limitations and improving growth of desired species (Armitage et al., 2011; Balestri &
31 Lardicci, 2014; Fereidooni et al., 2013; Holmes, 2001; Jaquetti et al., 2014; Reed et al.,
32 2007). However, in some environments, fertilizers can have a negative effect on
33 species diversity and in extreme cases may even pollute the surrounding environment
34 (Fonseca et al., 1998; Hill & Heck, 2015; Zedler, 2000). Therefore, consideration of the
35 ecosystem, nutrient needs, and type of fertilizer is important to maximizing the benefits
36 of fertilization approaches while minimizing the environmental impact of fertilizer use.

37 The ramifications of fertilizer use are especially relevant in coastal seagrass
38 systems, which are both important habitats and currently facing global declines due to
39 human disturbance and climate change (Bayraktarov et al., 2016). Seagrasses are a
40 comparatively difficult and expensive coastal ecosystem to restore, partially due to
41 eutrophication, competition from algae and other nutrient related issues (ibid).
42 However, fertilizers have been consistently found to improve seagrass health and
43 restoration success (Armitage et al., 2011; Kenworthy et al., 2018). Traditionally, both
44 the direct application of controlled release fertilizers (Armitage & Fourqurean, 2016;
45 Fonseca et al., 1998; Peralta et al., 2003; Sheridan et al., 1998) and the deployment of
46 bird roosting stakes (Fonseca et al., 1994; Furman et al., 2019) have positive effects on
47 seagrass biomass, and can accelerate ecosystem succession for seagrass (Bourque &

48 Fourqurean, 2014; Armitage et al., 2011). However, the use of traditional fertilization
49 techniques in seagrass restoration may result in variable levels of nutrients or over-
50 fertilization (Fonseca et al., 1998; Kenworthy et al., 2018), with consequences for the
51 succession of seagrass species (ibid).

52 One of the main issues with fertilization in aquatic seagrass systems is that
53 immersion and hydrodynamics can lead to rapid dissolution of fertilizers, increasing
54 short term nutrient availability to the desired plant species, but at the expense of nutrient
55 loss, ecosystem disruption, and pollution (Fonseca et al., 1998; Hill & Heck, 2015;
56 Olsen & Valiela, 2010). For example, Hall et al. (2006) had to replace buried fertilizer
57 pellets every three to four months in a macrophyte restoration effort, while Herbert and
58 Fourqurean (2008) found that bird stakes (bird roosting structures that promote feces
59 accumulation, Fonseca et al., 1994; Furman et al., 2019) can overfertilize seagrass
60 sites, disrupting succession and increasing epiphytic biomass. These drawbacks are
61 due either to the fertilizers being adapted for terrestrial applications, releasing nutrients
62 too rapidly after flushing with water, or in the case of bird stakes, due to variable rates of
63 feces deposition combined with diffusion of nutrients in the water during precipitation
64 and settling (Hill & Heck, 2015). Applying multiple doses of traditional mineral fertilizers
65 (Ferdie & Fourqurean, 2004; Hall et al., 2006; Olsen & Valiela, 2010) or monitoring bird
66 stake treated beds for symptoms of excess fertilization (Kenworthy et al., 2018) also
67 incurs a significant financial and labor cost. Thus, a slower dissolving fertilizer that
68 resists leaching may reduce overfertilization and labor expenses while still providing
69 benefits toward seagrass growth and survival.



70 Struvite (magnesium ammonium phosphate, or $MgNH_4PO_4 \cdot 6H_2O$) is a by-
71 product of wastewater treatment that is harvested in separated, side-stream sludge
72 management processes (Ghosh et al., 2019). Struvite is poorly soluble in water, but
73 releases P more rapidly in the presence of organic acids exuded from roots, making it a
74 potentially ideal fertilizer for direct plant uptake (Cabeza et al., 2011; Robles-Aguilar et
75 al., 2019). Past studies have supported both high performance of struvite for terrestrial
76 plant applications as well as its resistance to flushing (Lee et al., 2009; Rahman et al.,
77 2014).

78 While the utilization of struvite in aquatic systems appears very promising, to
79 date there is an absence of studies investigating this fertilizer in marine restoration
80 projects, especially in combination with other fertilization techniques. While it has been
81 demonstrated that struvite is poorly soluble fertilizer except when exposed to acidic
82 conditions (Cabeza et al., 2011; Talboys et al., 2016), experiments determining the
83 availability of struvite to submerged aquatic vegetation do not currently exist. Thus, the
84 goals of this study were to 1) assess potential differences in seagrass performance
85 (shoot count, growth, length, and biomass as defined by Arrington, 2008, Herbeck et al.,
86 2014, Rezek et al., 2019, Short & Coles, 2001, and Thomsen et al., 2012) after addition
87 of struvite versus a polymer coated, controlled release fertilizer (Osmocote™)
88 commonly used in seagrass restoration, and 2) to determine shifts in sediment and
89 porewater nutrients caused by the introduction of the fertilizers in plots with and without
90 seagrass. We hypothesized that seagrass in plots fertilized with struvite would have
91 increased performance compared to plots fertilized with Osmocote™, and that struvite



92 would be dissolved at a slower rate than Osmocote™ (based on porewater total
93 dissolved nutrients).

94 **2. Materials and Methods**

95 **2.1. Site Description and Design**

96 To minimize the variability found in field experiments and more accurately
97 investigate nutrient levels related to fertilization, a mesocosm experiment was
98 conducted at the Whitney Laboratory of Marine Biosciences in St. Augustine, FL.
99 Seawater (filtered through a shelly sand and activated charcoal biofilter) pumped from
100 offshore entered a 6.5 m diameter mesocosm (approximately 1 m deep), to emulate the
101 natural environment. Water flow was constant into the mesocosm. Experiments were
102 based on the methods explained in the propagation guide for *Halodule wrightii* (Biber et
103 al., 2013). Seagrass was collected directly from donor sites off St. Martins Marsh
104 Aquatic Preserve, FL. Shoots were removed from the donor sediment and maintained
105 in cool conditions until they were transplanted into plastic pot containers (10 cm depth),
106 buried in approximately 5 cm of coarse, shell-dominated sand taken from the local St.
107 Augustine area (rinsed to reduce organics and residual nutrients). The sediment used
108 had a mean grain size of 706 microns (not including particles greater than 2 mm).

109 **2.1.1 Mesocosm Conditions**

110 Mesocosm temperature and salinity remained between 27-31 °C and 33-38 parts
111 per thousand respectively during the periods sampled (between 9 am and 3 pm) for
112 both studies. The hydraulic residence time was variable at 0.5-2 days, due to a limited
113 saltwater supply. The mean TDN of surface water was 0.44 ± 0.06 mg N L⁻¹, while the
114 mean TDP was 0.035 ± 0.001 mg P L⁻¹ (or 0.029 mg P L⁻¹ when excluding a day of low
115 inflow). The level of flow was great enough to prevent significant cross contamination of

116 the plots studied, as well as prevent significant swings in temperature and salinity that
117 could stress the plants.

118 **2.2. Experiments**

119 Two separate experiments were conducted in the summer and fall of 2018. The
120 first 60-day experiment consisted of six different treatment options, including bare sand
121 with or without fertilizers (terrestrial polymer coated fertilizer or struvite) and seagrass
122 with or without fertilizers. A second 70-day experiment was conducted consisting of
123 multiple lower doses of both fertilizers.

124 **2.2.1. Single Dose/First Experiment**

125 For the polymer coated controlled release fertilizer treatment, Osmocote™
126 14:14:14 NPK (Scotts Miracle-Gro Company, Marysville, OH, USA) was chosen due to
127 its commercial availability, composition (containing both N and P), and past use in
128 seagrass restoration experiments (Peralta et al., 2003; Sheridan et al., 1998; Tanner &
129 Parham, 2010). Struvite used in the experiment was produced in a pilot scale fluidized
130 bed reactor fed with sludge dewatering liquor. Detailed morphological and elemental
131 characteristics are described elsewhere (Bydalek et al., 2018). Unlike the mostly
132 homogenous struvite, each Osmocote™ prill has a porous outer layer that gradually
133 releases a contained water-soluble nutrient dose through diffusion. The composition of
134 elements is also different between the two compounds; with $\text{NH}_4^+/\text{NO}_3^-$ -N comprising
135 14% of Osmocote™ versus NH_4^+ -N comprising only 6% of struvite (Osmocote™
136 manufacturer information, Kenworthy & Fonseca, 1992; Rahman et al., 2014). The P
137 composition of both fertilizers is also different, with struvite (13% P as PO_4^{3-}) versus



138 having a higher concentration by weight versus Osmocote™ (6.1% P as P₂O₅)
139 (Osmocote™ manufacturer information, Rahman et al., 2014).

140 In total, there were 30 plots, with an unplanted, untreated/unfertilized control
141 (labelled control, n= 4), sediment-only treatments (labelled Control-Osmo and Control-
142 Struv, n= 4), and seagrass control and treatments (labelled Seagrass, Seagrass-Osmo,
143 and Seagrass-Struv, n= 6). Nutrient treatments were fertilized by adding the
144 Osmocote™ or struvite equivalent of 3 g of P mixed into approximately 6 kg of sand
145 (equivalent to 0.5 mg P g⁻¹ DW sand), which was about half of what was considered
146 “low fertilized” according to Peralta et al. (2003). The dosing was equilibrated to P as
147 tropical seagrass systems are primarily P limited (Brodersen et al., 2017; Gras et al.,
148 2003). In this experiment, serving as pilot study, N concentrations were not equilibrated,
149 however given the actual fertilizer dosages, concentrations were still below the low
150 fertilized treatment in Peralta et al.’s study (0.23 mg N g⁻¹ DW sand for struvite and 1.16
151 mg N g⁻¹ DW sand for Osmocote respectively). Each seagrass plot had exactly three
152 individuals, each with five shoots. The first experiment was conducted for 60 days.
153 During this period, the levels of dissolved total P porewater concentrations were
154 excessively high, exceeding 100 mg P L⁻¹ in the Osmocote™ treatments and 5 mg P L⁻¹
155 for struvite.

156 **2.2.2. Multi-Dose/Second Experiment**

157 In this second experiment, struvite doses were 0.0125 (low dose struvite or
158 Seagrass-Struv-Lo), 0.025 (medium dose struvite or Seagrass-Struv-Med) and 0.05 mg
159 P g⁻¹ DW sand (high dose struvite or Seagrass-Struv-Hi). For Osmocote™, 0.0125 (low
160 dose Osmocote™ or Seagrass-Osmo-Lo) and 0.025 mg P g⁻¹ DW (medium dose

161 Osmocote™ or Seagrass-Osmo-Med) doses were used. Unplanted, fertilized controls
162 had a 0.0250 mg P g⁻¹ DW dose of Osmocote™ (Osmocote™ control or Control-Osmo)
163 and struvite (struvite control or Control-Struv). Unfertilized, unplanted plots were
164 labelled “control” while unfertilized, planted plots were labelled “unfertilized seagrass” or
165 “Seagrass-Control”. There were four replicates for all controls/treatments. A high dose
166 of Osmocote™ was not used due to space limitations in the mesocosm and concerns of
167 overfertilization based on the results of the single dose/first experiment. There were
168 three individuals with five shoots per plot (initially two individuals with the third added 10
169 days post deployment to match the starting shoot count of the previous experiment).

170 **2.3. Plant and Nutrient Measurements**

171 Seagrass shoot count (seagrass shoots defined as a unit of several leaves or
172 blades according to Short & Coles, 2001), were quantified approximately every 10 days
173 in both experiments. During the second experiment, blade/leaf lengths (substrate to
174 leaf tip according to Arrington, 2008) were also quantified. Surface water was sampled
175 for temperature, salinity, and total dissolved nutrients (Total Dissolved N/TDN, Total
176 Dissolved P/TDP), while porewater was only sampled for total nutrients and (randomly)
177 sulfide presence. Surface and porewater samples were collected using a syringe
178 sampler fashioned out of a 60 mL syringe attached to a plastic tube and 1 mL
179 serological pipette with an attached air stone. The samples were filtered through a 0.45
180 µm filter (Whatman, Maidstone, United Kingdom), preserved with sulfuric acid to a pH <
181 2, and stored at 4 °C until analysis in the Wetland Biogeochemistry Laboratory (USEPA,
182 1974, 1993). Porewater was also tested for the presence of sulfide (Calleja et al., 2007;
183 Carlson et al., 1994) using a Hach test kit (product number 2537800). No measurable

184 sulfide was found in any plots sampled (detection limit 0.1 mg L⁻¹). DOC and TDN
185 samples were analyzed on a Shimadzu TOC-L analyzer fitted with a N module
186 (Shimadzu Scientific Instruments, Durham, NC, USA) according to EPA method 415.1
187 for TOC and ASTM D 8083 for total nitrogen (TN) (ASTM International, 2016; Nevins et
188 al., 2020; USEPA, 1974). TDP was digested with persulfate in an autoclave and
189 analyzed via a Shimadzu UV-1800 spectrophotometer (Shimadzu Corporation, Kyoto,
190 Japan) using EPA method 365.1 (Irick et al., 2015; USEPA, 1993).

191 At the end of the experiment, plant biomass and sediment were destructively
192 sampled. Plants were rinsed to clean off sediments, and promptly frozen. In the lab,
193 tissue samples were cleaned of epiphytes and rinsed with de-ionized water. Plant
194 tissue and sediment samples were dried for 72 hours at 65 °C and ground using a ball
195 mill. Sediment was analyzed for total carbon (TC), and nitrogen (TN), while tissue was
196 analyzed for TC, TN, and phosphorus (TP). Bulk sediment TC/TN were run on an ECS
197 4010 CHNSO analyzer (Costech Analytical Technologies, Inc., Valencia, CA, USA)
198 (Nevins et al., 2020). Tissue TP was determined by ashing the sample followed by
199 dissolution with 6 M HCL (following Andersen, 1976) and analysis for soluble P using a
200 Shimadzu UV-1800 spectrophotometer (Shimadzu Corporation, Kyoto, Japan) (Liao et
201 al., 2019; USEPA, 1993). Due to low and variable weights found after drying seagrass
202 samples, plant dry biomass was calculated using a 10% wet weight conversion used for
203 *H. wrightii* and *Thalassia testudinum* in Heck et al., (2015) and outlined in Short &
204 Coles, (2001). A sediment particle analysis was also conducted to determine the
205 distribution of particle sizes and possible changes over time. These samples were
206 analyzed by the Soil and Water Sciences Environmental Pedology and Land Use

207 Laboratory using laser diffraction (LD) with a Beckman Coulter LS-13320 multi-wave
208 particle size analyzer (Beckman Coulter Diagnostics, Brea, CA, USA).

209 **2.4. Statistical Analyses**

210 Differences in seagrass metrics (shoot count and shoot length) and porewater
211 nutrients for both experiments were calculated using a linear mixed model, followed by
212 a post hoc multiple comparison significant (Fisher's Least Significant Difference test).
213 Factors included the treatment type, date, and the interaction between treatment and
214 date. A linear mixed model analysis was also conducted on sediment and biomass
215 measurements from the second experiment, testing the effect of treatment type. The
216 tests were run using JMP 15.2.1 (SAS Software, Cary, NC, USA) with significance set
217 to $\alpha = 0.05$. To determine the fit of the model predictions to the measured data,
218 residuals and qq-plots were visually inspected and data was log transformed as
219 necessary (shoot counts, shoot lengths, and total dissolved nutrients). To differentiate
220 between the effects of fertilization methods, K-means clustering was applied to classify
221 all observations in the multi-dose/second experiment. K-means were computed using
222 the `kmeans` function in R (version R-4.0.2.). Given the number of observations ($n = 6$) the
223 data was predefined into two clusters (`centers = 2`). Prior to the analysis, the data was
224 standardized using the `scale` function (each element is subtracted by the mean value of
225 the vector and divided by standard deviation of the vector). The results were visualized
226 using the `fviz_cluster` function (factoextra package) based on function's encoded
227 principal component analysis (PCA) (Kassambara & Mundt, 2017).

228 **3. Results**

229 **3.1. Single Dose/First Experiment**

230 **3.1.1 Plant Metrics**



231 Increases in shoot counts occurred one month after transplantation for the
232 struvite treatment. However, this was not the case with the unfertilized control or the
233 Seagrass-Osmo treatment, which both slowly declined on average. At the end of the
234 first experiment, mean shoot counts ranged from 6.33 ± 0.87 shoots in the Seagrass-
235 Osmo treatment to 52.33 ± 5.49 shoots in the Seagrass-Struv treatment (Figure 1).
236 Seagrasses in struvite fertilized plots had significantly higher shoot counts than the
237 seagrass control and Osmocote treatment ($p < 0.01$). More specifically, the Seagrass-
238 Struv treatment had a significantly higher shoot count in mid-July, just one month after
239 planting ($p < 0.05$), becoming greater over the next month (by end of the study $p <$
240 0.001). By the end of the study, the unfertilized seagrass also had a significantly higher
241 number of shoots than the Seagrass-Osmo treatment ($t = 2.56$, $p < 0.05$).

242 **3.1.2 Water Chemistry**

243 The TDP levels were significantly higher in the Seagrass-Osmo plots than the
244 unfertilized controls and Seagrass-Struv treatments ($p < 0.0001$, table S1). By the end
245 of the study, the average TDP concentration for the Seagrass-Osmo porewater plots
246 was 136.09 ± 15.71 mg P L⁻¹ for the unplanted plots (Control-Osmo) and 109.53 ± 19.96
247 mg P L⁻¹ for the planted plots (Seagrass-Osmo), more over ten times higher than the
248 struvite plots, which was 2.43 ± 0.61 mg P L⁻¹ in the unplanted plots and 0.76 ± 0.19 mg
249 P L⁻¹ in the Seagrass-Struv plots. Porewater TDP in the Control-Struv treatment was
250 significantly higher than the control, unfertilized seagrass, and the Seagrass-Struv
251 treatments ($p < 0.001$), indicating that significant uptake of TDP by seagrasses likely
252 occurred. There were no significant differences in TDP between the unplanted and
253 planted Seagrass-Osmo plots, overall or during any specific sampling date.

254 **3.2. Multi-Dose/Second Experiment**

255 **3.2.1. Plant Metrics**

256 At the end of the second experiment, the average seagrass shoot counts ranged
257 from 8.00 ± 0.41 shoots in the Seagrass-Control to 14.50 ± 3.10 shoots in the
258 Seagrass-Struv-Med treatment (Figure 2). There was relatively less growth in the
259 second experiment versus the first/single dose experiment, however the effects of date
260 and its interaction with the treatment type were still significant for shoot count (Table S-
261 2). After 53 days, seagrass shoot count started showing signs of treatment effect in
262 comparison to control seagrass plot which showed significant shoot count declines ($p <$
263 0.05) in comparison to the rest of the fertilized seagrass plots. By the end of the
264 experiment (74 days) only the Seagrass-Struv-Med treated seagrass plots maintained
265 plant density (14.50 ± 3.10 shoots) close to the original coverage of 15 shoots per plot
266 indicating high transplantation survival rate. At the conclusion of the study, only the
267 struvite fertilized plots were statistically higher in shoot count than unfertilized plots.

268 The effects of both treatment and date were significant for blade length (Table
269 S-2). All fertilized treatments became significantly greater in length than the Seagrass-
270 Control after 39 days post deployment (Figure 2). The average seagrass blade length
271 ranged from 9.1 ± 1.02 cm in the unfertilized seagrass to 19.1 ± 1.74 cm in the medium
272 dose struvite by the end of the experiment. The highest increase in blade length was
273 observed in struvite treatments. The Seagrass-Struv-Med treatment showed a
274 significantly ($p < 0.005$) higher blade growth than the Seagrass-Osmo-Lo/Med
275 treatments.



276 The mean aboveground biomass ranged from 0.012 ± 0.004 g DW in the
277 Seagrass-Control to 0.080 ± 0.011 g DW in the Seagrass-Struv-Hi treatment (Figure 3),
278 with the effect of treatment type being significant (Table S-3). All fertilized plots had
279 significantly higher aboveground biomass than the control, except for the Seagrass-
280 Osmo-Lo treatment ($p < 0.05$). There was a marginal significance found for the Med
281 and Hi struvite doses having higher aboveground biomass than the Seagrass-Osmo-
282 Med ($p < 0.08$). Belowground biomass ranged from 0.11 ± 0.02 g DW in the Seagrass-
283 Control to 0.20 ± 0.01 g DW in the Seagrass-Struv-Med treatment (Figure 3). The
284 belowground biomass of control plots was significantly lower compared to all fertilized
285 plots except for the Seagrass-Osmo-Med (Table S-3). Additionally, the Seagrass-Struv-
286 Med dose had significantly higher belowground biomass compared to the Seagrass-
287 Osmo-Med and Seagrass-Struv-Hi doses ($p < 0.05$). Aboveground tissue %TN ranged
288 from 1.9% in the unfertilized seagrass (one sample) to $2.34 \pm 0.23\%$ in the Seagrass-
289 Struv-Lo treatment, while tissue %TP ranged from $0.236 \pm 0.007\%$ in the Seagrass-
290 Struv-Lo treatment to $0.258 \pm 0.016\%$ in the Seagrass-Osmo-Lo treatment (Table S-7).
291 There was no significant effect of treatment on aboveground %TN or %TP (Table 4).
292 The mean aboveground N:P ratios ranged between 8.3 ± 0.57 for the Seagrass-Osmo-
293 Lo and 10.0 ± 1.20 for Seagrass-Struv-Lo treatment. The N:P ratio and the mean
294 aboveground TN and TP weights in the seagrasses (calculated by multiplying the
295 biomass with the tissue %TN or %TP) yielded no significant differences (Tables S-4 and
296 7). Belowground tissue %TN ranged from $0.53 \pm 0.07\%$ for the Seagrass-Osmo-Lo
297 treatment to $0.84 \pm 0.06\%$ in the Seagrass-Osmo-Med treatment, while tissue %TP
298 ranged from $0.154 \pm 0.009\%$ for the Seagrass-Osmo-Lo treatment to $0.179 \pm 0.008\%$

299 for the Seagrass-Osmo-Med treatment. The effect of treatment type was significant for
300 belowground %TN (Table 4), with the Seagrass-Osmo-Med being significantly higher
301 than the Seagrass-Osmo-Lo ($p < 0.05$). No effects were significant for belowground
302 %TP. The mean belowground N:P ratio ranged from 3.4 ± 0.47 for the Seagrass-
303 Osmo-Lo and 4.7 ± 0.36 for the Seagrass-Osmo-Med treatment. The effect of
304 treatment type was significant for both the belowground mass of TN and TP (% total
305 nutrient x biomass, Table S-5).

306 **3.2.2. Water, Tissue, and Sediment Chemistry**

307 Nutrient dynamics in porewater differ significantly between the fertilizer types
308 indicating different dissolution kinetics and plant and substrate interaction. Unfertilized
309 control plots (planted and unplanted) showed variable TDN concentrations throughout
310 the experiment however, never surpassing 2 mg TDN L^{-1} . Background porewater TDP
311 content in observed controls varied within $0.05\text{-}0.15 \text{ mg TDP L}^{-1}$. The biggest nutrient
312 release was observed at plots fertilized with Osmocote with peak nutrient
313 concentrations occurring at 6th day of experiment reaching $26.8 \pm 7.53 \text{ mg TDN L}^{-1}$ and
314 $17.68 \pm 6.74 \text{ mg TDP L}^{-1}$ for medium Osmocote dose. TDP dynamics in struvite
315 seagrass treatments were highly variable throughout the time and showed alternating
316 pulses of TDP release. However, by the end of the experiment porewater TDP content
317 in struvite fertilized plots was 2-3 times lower than in respective Osmocote treatments.
318 DOC measured at the end of the study was between $12.26 \pm 0.67 \text{ mg DOC L}^{-1}$ for
319 Seagrass-Struv-Lo and $14.71 \pm 1.23 \text{ mg DOC L}^{-1}$ for Seagrass-Osmo-Lo.

320 The average TC content of sediment ranged from $48.7 \pm 5.02 \text{ g C kg}^{-1}$ in the
321 medium dose struvite to $58.2 \pm 5.63 \text{ g C kg}^{-1}$ in the Seagrass-Struv-Hi, while the



322 average TN content ranged from $2.02 \pm 0.032 \text{ g N kg}^{-1}$ in the Seagrass-Control to $2.10 \pm$
323 0.020 g kg^{-1} in the Seagrass-Struv-Hi treatment (Table S-6). There were no significant
324 differences in the TC or TN contents between treatments (Table S-7).

325 Porewater nutrients and seagrass metrics were used to further assess the global
326 effect of fertilization dose and method based on multivariate analysis. K-means
327 clustering detected two separate groups. The struvite treatment was clearly
328 distinguished from the Osmocote™ treatment and control plot, occupying separated,
329 non-overlapping clusters on the PCA plane (Figure 4), reinforcing the significant effects
330 of struvite on seagrass and its surrounding environment.

331 **4. Discussion**

332 **4.1. Factors in Seagrass Performance**

333 Fertilizer application improved seagrass metrics compared to the unfertilized
334 control in all but the Seagrass-Osmo treatment of the first experiment. This included
335 average shoot count (more than six times higher vs the control at the end of the first
336 experiment, and up to 81% at the end of the second experiment), length (up to 110% at
337 the end of the second experiment, Figure 2), and biomass (up to 138% at the end of the
338 second experiment, Figure 3). In general, these results support past findings
339 examining the effects of fertilizer in the restoration of seagrass ecosystems (Armitage et
340 al., 2011; Kenworthy et al., 2018). Additionally, the results of this study found that
341 compared to equivalent P dosages with Osmocote, fertilization using struvite resulted in
342 higher average seagrass shoot count (more than eight times higher by the end of the
343 first experiment, and 29% at the end of the second experiment), length (up to 36% at
344 the end of the second experiment, Figure 2), and biomass (up to 60% higher total
345 biomass at the end of the second experiment, Figure 3). The significant multivariate

346 improvements in plant metrics in both experiments are promising towards the use of
347 struvite as a fertilizer to rapidly establish seagrass species in future restoration efforts.

348 In addition to improving seagrass metrics, struvite consistently released less
349 nutrients than Osmocote™. Porewater TDN was excessive in the Osmocote™
350 treatment in the first experiment (> 100 mg/L). In the second experiment, TDN in
351 struvite treated plots was as low as 12% of Osmocote™ treated plots (Table S-8).
352 Porewater TDP in equivalent struvite doses was less than 2% TDP of Osmocote™ in
353 the first experiment (Figure 1), and as low as 10% P of Osmocote™ in equivalent
354 struvite doses in the second experiment (Table S-8). The speed of nutrient release by
355 Osmocote™ was so high, that it may have contributed to the decreased performance of
356 the Osmocote™ treatments through excessive N levels, as evidenced by roots that
357 appeared stunted from possible root burn (observed in the first experiment, Figure S-1),
358 commonly associated with N exposure (NC State, 2018; Schönau & Herbert, 1983).

359 The possible root burn in Osmocote™ treated seagrass may be the result of
360 nitrate (Peralta et al., 2003; Statton et al., 2014) or ammonia (van der Heide et al.,
361 2008) fractions in the fertilizer. However, previous seagrass (*Zostera marina*)
362 mesocosm studies have detected increased seagrass metrics following Osmocote™
363 fertilization. For example, *Zostera marina* plants were found to have increased shoot
364 counts after one month of Osmocote™ 14:14:14 NPK fertilizer exposure compared to
365 unfertilized plots (Wang et al., 2020). Similarly, another study found significant
366 differences in shoot length in *Z. marina* over a period of two months when exposed to
367 fertilizer doses higher than those used in this study (Peralta et al., 2003). In these
368 cases, it should be noted that *Z. marina* exhibited a “remarkable tolerance” of N and P

369 fertilization, and many species of seagrass may not be as flexible regarding higher
370 levels of nutrient exposure.

371 Another factor affecting the difference between struvite and Osmocote™ could
372 be the balance of N versus P. In the second experiment, the aboveground tissue N:P
373 ratios (8.3 ± 0.57 to 10.0 ± 1.20 , Table S-9) consistently exceeded the traditionally
374 accepted threshold for a balanced nutrient supply for seagrasses (14 weight N:P ratio
375 calculated from the 30:1 molar N:P ratio as provided by Atkinson & Smith, [1983]). A
376 study of *H. wrightii* found that in a natural system (Florida Bay) the molar N:P was over
377 20, while in a fertilized scenario (using bird roosting stakes) the ratio was approximately
378 13 (Powell et al., 1989). Thus, the authors argued that *H. wrightii* was P limited in a
379 natural setting, and N limited when fertilized. Another study in Florida Bay found that *H.*
380 *wrightii* was “released” from P limitation at tissue N:P weight ratios between 9.7 and 21
381 (Armitage et al., 2011). Generally, the *H. wrightii* in all fertilized plots did not appear to
382 be strongly limited by a specific nutrient, exceeding the 1.8% TN/ 0.2% TP tissue
383 nutrient requirement defined by Duarte (1990). The exception to this may have been
384 the control, which was closer to N limitation than all plots with a 1.9% TN tissue content,
385 although this conclusion is tenuous because only one replicate was able to be analyzed
386 due to a lack of biomass.

387 The lack of significant differences in tissue nutrient content between fertilized and
388 non-fertilized treatments may be due to delays in nutrient response by the plants. For
389 example, one study found that it took *Thalassia testudinum* four months to acquire
390 elevated N levels after fertilizer exposure, while elevated P levels in plants took up to 14
391 months to develop (Ferdie & Fourqurean, 2004). While *H. wrightii* is a faster growing



392 species, and higher growth was demonstrated in fertilized vs non-fertilized plots, the
393 limited experiment duration may not have fully captured long-term increases in tissue
394 content. However, significant differences in belowground nutrient content (i.e. medium
395 dose struvite vs. non-fertilized control, Table S-4) and tissue nutrient weight (Table S-5)
396 indicate uptake of nutrients by the seagrass.

397 Furthermore, the size of the mesocosm plots may have been a factor in the high
398 porewater nutrient levels by preventing lateral flow of porewater and limiting diffusion.
399 The current flow and increased sediment depth may dilute porewater, increase
400 diffusion, and reduce the effectiveness of fertilizers in a natural environment, requiring
401 more fertilizer for field studies. This potential problem may be partially compensated by
402 the relatively large grain size of the shelly sand used in the study, compared to the often
403 silty sand found in seagrass systems (a property produced by seagrass beds as
404 discussed in Folmer et al., 2012). The lack of sulfide present in the experiment also
405 indicates a higher redox potential that is likely not present in field experiments.

406 This study demonstrated that struvite and Osmocote™ both released N and P for
407 at least two months (Table S-8). Based on longer studies, it is expected that
408 Osmocote™ would provide N and P for 4-6 months (Hall et al., 2006; Olsen and Valiela,
409 2010). Struvite may be able to provide nutrients for longer periods, indicated by its
410 slower release rate. After the second experiment, selected fertilized plots were moved
411 to another mesocosm and left submerged. A year after the experiment was deployed,
412 the only evidence found of the Osmocote™ fertilizer were the outer membranes of the
413 prills, whereas struvite granules were still found in the mesocosm plots, indicating a
414 potential continued release of nutrients. Thus, while the effects of struvite were only

415 measured for up to nine weeks, the presence of struvite after this extended period
416 indicates that struvite could be effective throughout a whole growing season or longer.
417 The ability of struvite to produce higher seagrass metrics while emitting less nutrients
418 (indicating a more sustained release of nutrients over a longer period of time) is
419 promising toward the future applications of struvite in future coastal restoration efforts.

420 **4.2. Field Applications of the Study**

421 The controlled environment of the mesocosm study allowed tests to be done with
422 minimal interference from the confounding variables of a field study. However, several
423 external factors may still have affected the results of the two experiments. The first
424 experiment was conducted at the peak of the seagrass growing season (June through
425 August), whereas the second experiment occurred during the end of the season
426 (August through October, with the season typically ending in September; Choice et al.,
427 2014). The later date of deployment could help explain why differences between shoot
428 counts were not as apparent in the second experiment. Based on the declining
429 seagrass performance above the medium/ $0.025 \text{ mg P g}^{-1} \text{ DW}$ dose, there may have
430 been even larger differences in the first experiment between struvite and Osmocote™ if
431 the second experiment was begun earlier in the summer.

432 When considering the broad applicability of the results, it is important to note how
433 close the conditions in the mesocosm were mimicking the natural environment. First,
434 the local sediment substrate was not sterilized and contained a representative microbial
435 population. Similarly, seawater for the mesocosm was only prefiltered to minimize inputs
436 of algae or debris, and largely maintained the natural composition and physiochemistry.
437 The mesocosm environment was sheltered from hydrodynamic disturbance and

438 herbivory which are significant problems in field restoration efforts (Bourque &
439 Fourqurean, 2013; W. Kenworthy et al., 2018; Tuya et al., 2017). However, there are
440 numerous techniques such as protective cages, or biodegradable lattices, artificial
441 seagrass, in ground fertilizer application, and sediment tubes that aim to minimize
442 environmental disturbances and which can be successfully integrated into restoration
443 projects utilizing fertilizers (Hall et al., 2006; Hammerstrom et al., 1998; W. J. Kenworthy
444 et al., 2018; Li et al., 2019; MacDonnell et al., 2022; Temmink et al., 2020; Tuya et al.,
445 2017).

446 Multiple field and mesocosm seagrass studies investigating the use of
447 Osmocote™ have yielded generally similar results (Peralta et al., 2003; Pereda-Briones
448 et al., 2018; Tanner & Parham, 2010). Both struvite/Osmocote™ experiments could be
449 considered extensions of these previous investigations with real world applications.
450 However, it must be noted that a successful mesocosm scale study such as this one
451 cannot simply be scaled up to field applications. Rather, it would require the additional
452 understanding of local environmental conditions and applied restoration techniques that
453 enhance the success rate. Therefore, a future field study would be recommended to
454 optimize the dose of struvite in different biogeochemical conditions and assess
455 associated operational efforts and costs.

456 **4.3. Implications/Applications of Struvite**

457 The integration of struvite in restoration projects could have multiple advantages
458 for both environmental management and sustainability of wastewater treatment. First,
459 more research is needed, but struvite is potentially less harmful for the environment
460 than traditional commercial fertilizers. For example, struvite is sourced from
461 wastewater, a source of eutrophication for many coastal systems (Mayer et al., 2016).

462 The N content of struvite is also relatively low, and while it still provides plants with
463 nutrients, it limits excess fertilization and resulting nitrous oxide emissions (Rahman et
464 al., 2014). Second, that struvite is sustainable and locally sourced has global
465 implications as P resources are being depleted in an accelerating rate, and there are
466 indications that demand will surpass supply within the next 20 years (Nedelciu et al.,
467 2020). The processing of struvite allows for the production of a P fertilizer without
468 dealing with the instability and increasing costs of importing fertilizer (Rufí-Salís et al.,
469 2020; Ye et al., 2020). Finally, the feasibility of using struvite on multiple scales has
470 been demonstrated in experiments and industrial applications, indicating a practical and
471 readily available treatment process (Ghosh et al., 2019).

472 The advantages of struvite in reducing pollution and phosphate shortages,
473 combined with its feasibility, make it an attractive alternative P and N fertilizer. Struvite
474 is a recognized slow-release terrestrial nutrient amendment with a low environmental
475 footprint. However, struvite application is still limited due to its high price in comparison
476 to conventional mineral fertilizers and availability. Therefore, extending application of
477 struvite into areas such as restoration could potentially create a new market, thus
478 making struvite more affordable and available. This is particularly important since
479 struvite represents a very important aspect of circular economy in water management.

480 **5. Summary and Conclusions**

481 Because of the current need for effective fertilization methods that minimize
482 environmental risk, this study evaluated the wastewater by-product struvite and its
483 potential to enhance seagrass growth under simulated natural conditions. Seagrass
484 growth metrics (shoots, length, biomass) in plots fertilized with struvite were consistently
485 equal to or better than the commercial fertilizer Osmocote™. This improvement in

486 seagrass performance was provided while also producing lower porewater nutrient
487 release from equal P fertilization doses, likely due to the slower release of nutrients from
488 struvite delivering a low but sustained load of N and P to the rhizosphere. Excessive N
489 inputs from the Osmocote™ treatment in the first experiment may have even reduced
490 performance of treated plots compared to the unfertilized control. Measurements of
491 porewater nutrients and visual observations indicated that struvite has a lower solubility
492 and is therefore longer lasting compared to Osmocote™ in marine conditions. Other
493 possible factors in plant performance, including the effects of specific nutrients (i.e.
494 temporal delays in N/P tissue concentration, micronutrient differences), current flow
495 (possibly increasing nutrient diffusion), and sediment particle size (affecting dissolution
496 rates and redox potential), will require further investigation.

497 Future studies should apply the results of this experiment in multiple coastal
498 systems, ensuring that results are not constrained to a seagrass mesocosm setting.
499 Testing the solubility of struvite in different environments may reveal more applications
500 for the fertilizer. Experiments should include other seagrass species with diverse
501 nutrient requirements, and ideally, a restoration experiment would take place over
502 multiple growing seasons to determine how long struvite remains effective. Special
503 consideration should also be given toward testing the effectiveness of struvite in a more
504 N-limited environment, where other fertilizers may have a better advantage. This study
505 was a first ever attempt to apply struvite in marine restoration project, serving as an
506 example of interdisciplinary merger between wastewater treatment engineering and
507 restoration ecology. The positive results here should encourage future research and

508 field activities to further explore the application of struvite and similar materials for
509 restoration projects.

510 **Funding Sources:**

511 This work was supported by a University of Florida Graduate Student Fellowship,
512 the Wetland Biogeochemistry Laboratory, and other funding from the Soil and Water
513 Sciences Department at the University of Florida. F. Bydalek was supported by faculty
514 of the Civil and Environmental Engineering department and the Gdańsk University of
515 Technology Fund for Young Scientists (2017/032455).

516 **Acknowledgements**

517 The authors acknowledge L. Mikell of the UF Wetlands Biogeochemistry
518 Laboratory for her help with water quality analyses, and Dr. A. Bacon for help in
519 sediment particle size analyses. We thank Dr. S. Barry, the Florida Oceanographic
520 Society, the Whitney Laboratory for Marine Biosciences, and Dr. L. Reynolds for
521 recommendations regarding seagrass transplantation and study designs. Special
522 thanks are addressed to James Colee from the IFAS statistical consulting unit for
523 confirming the quality of the data and the subsequent analyses.

524 **References**

- 525 Andersen, J. (1976). An ignition method for determination of total phosphorus in lake
526 sediments. *Water Research*, 10(4), 329–331. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0043-](https://doi.org/10.1016/0043-1354(76)90175-5)
527 [1354\(76\)90175-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0043-1354(76)90175-5)
- 528 Armitage, A., Frankovich, T., & Fourqurean, J. (2011). Long-term effects of adding
529 nutrients to an oligotrophic coastal environment. *Ecosystems*, 14, 430–444.
530 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10021-011-9421-2>

- 531 Armitage, A. R., & Fourqurean, J. W. (2016). Carbon storage in seagrass soils: Long-
532 term nutrient history exceeds the effects of near-term nutrient enrichment.
533 *Biogeosciences*, 13(1), 313–321. <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-13-313-2016>
- 534 Arrington, D. A. (2008). *Loxahatchee River water quality and biological monitoring task*
535 *13B: Final report spatial and temporal dynamics of seagrass in the Loxahatchee*
536 *River estuary during the period October 2007- September 2008*. 19.
- 537 ASTM International. (2016). *D8083-16 Standard Test Method for Total Nitrogen, and*
538 *Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen (TKN) by Calculation, in Water by High Temperature*
539 *Catalytic Combustion and Chemiluminescence Detection*. ASTM International.
540 <https://doi.org/10.1520/D8083-16>
- 541 Atkinson, M. J., & Smith, S. V. (1983). C:N:P ratios of benthic marine plants. *Limnology*
542 *and Oceanography*, 28(3), 568–574. <https://doi.org/10.4319/lo.1983.28.3.0568>
- 543 Balestri, E., & Lardicci, C. (2014). Effects of sediment fertilization and burial on
544 *Cymodocea nodosa* transplants; Implications for seagrass restoration under a
545 changing climate. *Restoration Ecology*, 22(2), 240–247.
546 <https://doi.org/10.1111/rec.12052>
- 547 Bayraktarov, E., Saunders, M. I., Abdullah, S., Mills, M., Beher, J., Possingham, H. P.,
548 Mumby, P. J., & Lovelock, C. E. (2016). The cost and feasibility of marine coastal
549 restoration. *Ecological Applications*, 26(4), 1055–1074.
550 <https://doi.org/10.1890/15-1077>
- 551 Biber, P., Caldwell, J. D., & Marenberg, M. (2013). CPR *Halodule wrightii*. *University of*
552 *Southern Mississippi*.

- 553 Bourque, A. S., & Fourqurean, J. W. (2013). Variability in herbivory in subtropical
554 seagrass ecosystems and implications for seagrass transplanting. *Journal of*
555 *Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, 445, 29–37.
556 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jembe.2013.03.014>
- 557 Bourque, A. S., & Fourqurean, J. W. (2014). Effects of common seagrass restoration
558 methods on ecosystem structure in subtropical seagrass meadows. *Marine*
559 *Environmental Research*, 97, 67–78.
560 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marenvres.2014.03.001>
- 561 Brodersen, K. E., Koren, K., Moßhammer, M., Ralph, P. J., Kühl, M., & Santner, J.
562 (2017). Seagrass-mediated phosphorus and iron solubilization in tropical
563 sediments. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 51(24), 14155–14163.
564 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.7b03878>
- 565 Bydałek, F., Kula, A., & Małkinia, J. (2018). Morphology and elemental composition of
566 product obtained from struvite fluidized bed reactor. *Civil and Environmental*
567 *Engineering Reports*, 28(2), 139–149. <https://doi.org/10.2478/ceer-2018-0025>
- 568 Cabeza, R., Steingrobe, B., Römer, W., & Claassen, N. (2011). Effectiveness of
569 recycled P products as P fertilizers, as evaluated in pot experiments. *Nutrient*
570 *Cycling in Agroecosystems*, 91(2), 173. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10705-011-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10705-011-9454-0)
571 [9454-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10705-011-9454-0)
- 572 Calleja, M. LI., Marbà, N., & Duarte, C. M. (2007). The relationship between seagrass
573 (*Posidonia oceanica*) decline and sulfide porewater concentration in carbonate
574 sediments. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, 73(3), 583–588.
575 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2007.02.016>

- 576 Carlson, P., Yarbro, L., & Barber, T. (1994). Relationship of sediment sulfide to mortality
577 of *Thalassia testudinum* in Florida Bay. *Bulletin of Marine Science*, 54, 733–746.
- 578 Choice, Z. D., Frazer, T. K., & Jacoby, C. A. (2014). Light requirements of seagrasses
579 determined from historical records of light attenuation along the Gulf coast of
580 peninsular Florida. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 81(1), 94–102.
581 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2014.02.015>
- 582 Duarte, C. M. (1990). Seagrass nutrient content. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*,
583 67(2), 201–207.
- 584 Ferdie, M., & Fourqurean, J. W. (2004). Responses of seagrass communities to
585 fertilization along a gradient of relative availability of nitrogen and phosphorus in
586 a carbonate environment. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 49(6), 2082–2094.
587 <https://doi.org/10.4319/lo.2004.49.6.2082>
- 588 Fereidooni, M., Raiesi, F., & Fallah, S. (2013). Ecological restoration of soil respiration,
589 microbial biomass and enzyme activities through broiler litter application in a
590 calcareous soil cropped with silage maize. *Ecological Engineering*, 58, 266–277.
591 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoleng.2013.06.032>
- 592 Folmer, E. O., van der Geest, M., Jansen, E., Olf, H., Michael Anderson, T., Piersma,
593 T., & van Gils, J. A. (2012). Seagrass–sediment feedback: An exploration using a
594 non-recursive structural equation model. *Ecosystems*, 15(8), 1380–1393.
595 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10021-012-9591-6>
- 596 Fonseca, M. S., Kenworthy, W. J., Courtney, F. X., & Hall, M. O. (1994). Seagrass
597 Planting in the Southeastern United States: Methods for Accelerating Habitat

- 598 Development. *Restoration Ecology*, 2(3), 198–212.
- 599 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1526-100X.1994.tb00067.x>
- 600 Fonseca, M. S., Kenworthy, W. J., & Thayer, G. W. (1998). *Guidelines for the*
- 601 *conservation and restoration of seagrasses in the United States and adjacent*
- 602 *waters* (noaa:1672). <https://repository.library.noaa.gov/view/noaa/1672>
- 603 Furman, B. T., Merello, M., Shea, C. P., Kenworthy, W. J., & Hall, M. O. (2019).
- 604 Monitoring of physically restored seagrass meadows reveals a slow rate of
- 605 recovery for *Thalassia testudinum*. *Restoration Ecology*, 27(2), 421–430.
- 606 <https://doi.org/10.1111/rec.12877>
- 607 Ghosh, S., Lobanov, S., & Lo, V. K. (2019). An overview of technologies to recover
- 608 phosphorus as struvite from wastewater: Advantages and shortcomings.
- 609 *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 26(19), 19063–19077.
- 610 Gras, A. F., Koch, M. S., & Madden, C. J. (2003). Phosphorus uptake kinetics of a
- 611 dominant tropical seagrass *Thalassia testudinum*. *Aquatic Botany*, 76(4), 299–
- 612 315. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3770\(03\)00069-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3770(03)00069-X)
- 613 Hall, M. O., Merello, M., Kenworthy, W. J., Berns, D., Ferenc, K., Kunzelman, J., Hall,
- 614 F., & Hyniova, J. (2006). *Developing Techniques to Enhance the Recovery Rates*
- 615 *of Propeller Scars in Turtlegrass (Thalassia testudinum) Meadows*. USFWS.
- 616 Hammerstrom, K., Sheridan, P., & McMahan, C. (1998). Potential for seagrass
- 617 restoration in Galveston Bay, Texas. *Texas Journal of Science*, 50, 35–50.
- 618 Heck, K., Fodrie, F., Madsen, S., Baillie, C., & Byron, D. (2015). Seagrass consumption
- 619 by native and a tropically associated fish species: Potential impacts of the

620 tropicalization of the northern Gulf of Mexico. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*,
621 520, 165–173. <https://doi.org/10.3354/meps11104>

622 Herbeck, L. S., Sollich, M., Unger, D., Holmer, M., & Jennerjahn, T. C. (2014). Impact of
623 pond aquaculture effluents on seagrass performance in NE Hainan, tropical
624 China. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 85(1), 190–203.
625 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2014.05.050>

626 Herbert, D. A., & Fourqurean, J. W. (2008). Ecosystem structure and function still
627 altered two decades after short-term fertilization of a seagrass meadow.
628 *Ecosystems*, 11(5), 688–700. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10021-008-9151-2>

629 Hill, J. M., & Heck, K. L. (2015). Non-consumptive effects of avian predators on fish
630 behavior and cascading indirect interactions in seagrasses. *Oikos*, 124(6), 750–
631 761. <https://doi.org/10.1111/oik.01774>

632 Holmes, P. M. (2001). Shrubland restoration following woody alien invasion and mining:
633 Effects of topsoil depth, seed source, and fertilizer addition. *Restoration Ecology*,
634 9(1), 71–84. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1526-100x.2001.009001071.x>

635 Irick, D. L., Gu, B., Li, Y. C., Inglett, P. W., Frederick, P. C., Ross, M. S., Wright, A. L., &
636 Ewe, S. M. L. (2015). Wading bird guano enrichment of soil nutrients in tree
637 islands of the Florida Everglades. *The Science of the Total Environment*, 532,
638 40–47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2015.05.097>

639 Jaquetti, R. K., Gonçalves, J. F. de C., Ferraz, J. B. S., Ferreira, M. J., Junior, U. M. dos
640 S., & Lacerda, C. F. de. (2014). Green fertilization enhances the photosynthetic
641 performance and the growth of leguminous trees for restoration plantation in

- 642 Central Amazon. *American Journal of Plant Sciences*, 2014.
- 643 <https://doi.org/10.4236/ajps.2014.516264>
- 644 Kassambara, A., & Mundt, F. (2017). Factoextra: Extract and visualize the results of
645 multivariate data analyses. *R Package Version*, 1(5), 337–354.
- 646 Kenworthy, J. W., & Fonseca, M. S. (1992). The use of fertilizer to enhance growth of
647 transplanted seagrasses *Zostera marina* and *Halodule wrightii* Aschers. *Journal*
648 *of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, 163(2), 141–161.
- 649 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0981\(92\)90045-C](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0981(92)90045-C)
- 650 Kenworthy, W. J., Hall, M. O., Hammerstrom, K. K., Merello, M., & Schwartzschild, A.
651 (2018). Restoration of tropical seagrass beds using wild bird fertilization and
652 sediment regrading. *Ecological Engineering*, 112, 72–81.
- 653 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoleng.2017.12.008>
- 654 Lee, J. E., Rahman, M. M., & Ra, C. S. (2009). Dose effects of Mg and PO₄ sources on
655 the composting of swine manure. *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, 169(1), 801–
656 807. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2009.04.026>
- 657 Li, M., Lundquist, C. J., Pilditch, C. A., Rees, T. a. V., & Ellis, J. (2019). Implications of
658 nutrient enrichment for the conservation and management of seagrass *Zostera*
659 *muelleri* meadows. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems*,
660 29(9), 1484–1502. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.3141>
- 661 Liao, X., Nair, V. D., Canion, A., Dobberfuhl, D. R., Foster, D. K., & Inglett, P. W. (2019).
662 Subsurface transport and potential risk of phosphorus to groundwater across
663 different land uses in a karst springs basin, Florida, USA. *Geoderma*, 338, 97–
664 106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2018.11.005>



- 665 MacDonnell, C., Tiling, K., Encomio, V., van der Heide, T., Teunis, M., Lengkeek, W.,
666 Didderen, K., Bouma, T. J., & Inglett, P. W. (2022). Evaluating a novel
667 biodegradable lattice structure for subtropical seagrass restoration. *Aquatic*
668 *Botany*, 176, 103463. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquabot.2021.103463>
- 669 Mayer, B. K., Baker, L. A., Boyer, T. H., Drechsel, P., Gifford, M., Hanjra, M. A.,
670 Parameswaran, P., Stoltzfus, J., Westerhoff, P., & Rittmann, B. E. (2016). Total
671 value of phosphorus recovery. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 50(13),
672 6606–6620. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.6b01239>
- 673 NC State. (2018). *North Carolina Extension Gardener Handbook*. NC State.
674 <https://content.ces.ncsu.edu/extension-gardener-handbook>
- 675 Nedelciu, C. E., Ragnarsdottir, K. V., Schlyter, P., & Stjernquist, I. (2020). Global
676 phosphorus supply chain dynamics: Assessing regional impact to 2050. *Global*
677 *Food Security*, 26, 100426.
- 678 Nevins, C. J., Strauss, S. L., & Inglett, P. W. (2020). Biological soil crusts enhance
679 moisture and nutrients in the upper rooting zone of sandy soil agroecosystems.
680 *Journal of Plant Nutrition and Soil Science*, 183(5), 615–626.
681 <https://doi.org/10.1002/jpln.202000218>
- 682 Olsen, Y. S., & Valiela, I. (2010). Effect of sediment nutrient enrichment and grazing on
683 turtle grass *Thalassia testudinum* in Jobos Bay, Puerto Rico. *Estuaries and*
684 *Coasts*, 33(3), 769–783. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12237-009-9256-7>
- 685 Peralta, G., Bouma, T., Soelen, J., Pérez-Lloréns, J., & Hernández, I. (2003). On the
686 use of sediment fertilization for seagrass restoration: A mesocosm study on

- 687 Zostera marina L. *Aquatic Botany*, 75, 95–110. <https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304->
688 3770(02)00168-7
- 689 Pereda-Briones, L., Tomas, F., & Terrados, J. (2018). Field transplantation of seagrass
690 (*Posidonia oceanica*) seedlings: Effects of invasive algae and nutrients. *Marine*
691 *Pollution Bulletin*, 134, 160–165. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2017.09.034>
- 692 Powell, G., Kenworthy, W., & Fourqurean, J. (1989). Experimental evidence for nutrient
693 limitation of seagrass growth in a tropical estuary with restricted circulation.
694 [/paper/Experimental-evidence-for-nutrient-limitation-of-in-Powell-](/paper/Experimental-evidence-for-nutrient-limitation-of-in-Powell-Kenworthy/5152405fa8e8d33240c6b33420bf32c063c07f2b)
695 <Kenworthy/5152405fa8e8d33240c6b33420bf32c063c07f2b>
- 696 Rahman, Md. M., Salleh, M. A. Mohd., Rashid, U., Ahsan, A., Hossain, M. M., & Ra, C.
697 S. (2014). Production of slow release crystal fertilizer from wastewaters through
698 struvite crystallization – A review. *Arabian Journal of Chemistry*, 7(1), 139–155.
699 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arabjc.2013.10.007>
- 700 Reed, S. C., Seastedt, T. R., Mann, C. M., Suding, K. N., Townsend, A. R., & Cherwin,
701 K. L. (2007). Phosphorus fertilization stimulates nitrogen fixation and increases
702 inorganic nitrogen concentrations in a restored prairie. *Applied Soil Ecology*,
703 36(2), 238–242. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsoil.2007.02.002>
- 704 Rezek, R., Furman, B., Jung, R., Hall, M., & Bell, S. (2019). Long-term performance of
705 seagrass restoration projects in Florida, USA. *Scientific Reports*, 9.
706 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-51856-9>
- 707 Robles-Aguilar, A. A., Pang, J., Postma, J. A., Schrey, S. D., Lambers, H., &
708 Jablonowski, N. D. (2019). The effect of pH on morphological and physiological
709 root traits of *Lupinus angustifolius* treated with struvite as a recycled phosphorus



710 source. *Plant and Soil*, 434(1), 65–78. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-018-3787->
711 2

712 Rufí-Salís, M., Brunnhofer, N., Petit-Boix, A., Gabarrell, X., Guisasola, A., & Villalba, G.
713 (2020). Can wastewater feed cities? Determining the feasibility and
714 environmental burdens of struvite recovery and reuse for urban regions. *Science*
715 *of The Total Environment*, 737, 139783.

716 Schönau, A., & Herbert, M. (1983). Relationship between growth rate, fertilizing and
717 foliar nutrient concentrations for *Eucalyptus grandis*; preliminary investigations.
718 *Fertilizer Research*, 4(4), 369–380. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01054010>

719 Sheridan, P., McMahan, G., Hammerstrom, K., & Jr, W. P. (1998). Factors affecting
720 restoration of *Halodule wrightii* to Galveston Bay, Texas. *Restoration Ecology*,
721 6(2), 144–158. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1526-100X.1998.00625.x>

722 Short, F., & Coles, R. G. (2001). *Global Seagrass Research Methods*. Elsevier.
723 <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-444-50891-1.X5000-2>

724 Statton, J., Kendrick, G. A., Dixon, K. W., & Cambridge, M. L. (2014). Inorganic nutrient
725 supplements constrain restoration potential of seedlings of the seagrass,
726 *Posidonia australis*. *Restoration Ecology*, 22(2), 196–203.
727 <https://doi.org/10.1111/rec.12072>

728 Talboys, P. J., Heppell, J., Roose, T., Healey, J. R., Jones, D. L., & Withers, P. J. A.
729 (2016). Struvite: A slow-release fertiliser for sustainable phosphorus
730 management? *Plant and Soil*, 401(1), 109–123. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104->
731 015-2747-3

- 732 Tanner, C. E., & Parham, T. (2010). Growing *Zostera marina* (eelgrass) from seeds in
733 land-based culture systems for use in restoration projects. *Restoration Ecology*,
734 18(4), 527–537. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1526-100X.2010.00693.x>
- 735 Temmink, R. J. M., Christianen, M. J. A., Fivash, G. S., Angelini, C., Boström, C.,
736 Didderen, K., Engel, S. M., Esteban, N., Gaeckle, J. L., Gagnon, K., Govers, L.
737 L., Infantes, E., van Katwijk, M. M., Kipson, S., Lamers, L. P. M., Lengkeek, W.,
738 Silliman, B. R., van Tussenbroek, B. I., Unsworth, R. K. F., ... van der Heide, T.
739 (2020). Mimicry of emergent traits amplifies coastal restoration success. *Nature*
740 *Communications*, 11(1), 3668. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-17438-4>
- 741 Thomsen, M. S., Wernberg, T., Engelen, A. H., Tuya, F., Vanderklift, M. A., Holmer, M.,
742 McGlathery, K. J., Arenas, F., Kotta, J., & Silliman, B. R. (2012). A meta-analysis
743 of seaweed impacts on seagrasses: Generalities and knowledge gaps. *PLoS*
744 *ONE*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0028595>
- 745 Tuya, F., Vila, F., Bergasa, O., Zarranz, M., Espino, F., & Robaina, R. R. (2017).
746 Artificial seagrass leaves shield transplanted seagrass seedlings and increase
747 their survivorship. *Aquatic Botany*, 136, 31–34.
748 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquabot.2016.09.001>
- 749 USEPA. (1974). *Organic Carbon, Total (Combustion or Oxidation). Method 415.1*. U.S.
750 Environmental Protection Agency.
- 751 USEPA. (1993). *Method 365.1, Revision 2.0: Determination of Phosphorus by Semi-*
752 *Automated Colorimetry*. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.
- 753 van der Heide, T., Smolders, A. J. P., Rijkens, B. G. A., van Nes, E. H., van Katwijk, M.
754 M., & Roelofs, J. G. M. (2008). Toxicity of reduced nitrogen in eelgrass (*Zostera*


755 marina) is highly dependent on shoot density and pH. *Oecologia*, 158(3), 411–
756 419. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-008-1155-2>

757 Wang, L., Tomas, F., & Mueller, R. S. (2020). Nutrient enrichment increases size of
758 *Zostera marina* shoots and enriches for sulfur and nitrogen cycling bacteria in
759 root-associated microbiomes. *FEMS Microbiology Ecology*, 96(8).
760 <https://doi.org/10.1093/femsec/fiaa129>

761 Ye, Y., Ngo, H. H., Guo, W., Chang, S. W., Nguyen, D. D., Zhang, X., Zhang, J., &
762 Liang, S. (2020). Nutrient recovery from wastewater: From technology to
763 economy. *Bioresource Technology Reports*, 100425.

764 Zedler, J. B. (2000). Progress in wetland restoration ecology. *Trends in Ecology &*
765 *Evolution*, 15(10), 402–407. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347\(00\)01959-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347(00)01959-5)

766



767

768

769

770

771

772

773

Figure 1. Porewater total dissolved phosphorus (TDP) (A), and seagrass shoot count

(B) taken during the first mesocosm experiment. The treatments were labelled



Seagrass (for the unfertilized seagrass plots), Seagrass-Osmocote™ (for planted plots

fertilized with Osmocote™), and Seagrass-Struv (planted plots fertilized with struvite).

The asterisks designate significant differences between treatments for the same sample

dates. Points represent the mean of six replicates (\pm SE).

35



774

775 Figure 2. Shoot count (A) and blade length (B) from the second mesocosm experiment.

776 The treatments were labelled Seagrass (unfertilized seagrass plots), Seagrass-Osmo-

777 Lo and Seagrass-Osmo-Med (planted plots fertilized with Osmocote™), Seagrass-


778 Struv-Low, Seagrass-Struv-Med, and Seagrass-Struv-High (planted plots fertilized with

779 struvite). *: Five shoots were added to each plot to match the first/single dose

780 experiment. Letters designate significant differences between treatments for the same

781 sample dates. Points represent the mean of four replicates (\pm SE), except for above-

782 ground biomass, which had two to four replicates.




783 Figure 3. Above and belowground biomass from the second mesocosm experiment.
784

785 The treatments were labelled Seagrass (unfertilized seagrass plots), Seagrass-Osmo-
786 Lo and Seagrass-Osmo-Med (planted plots fertilized with Osmocote™), Seagrass-
787 Struv-Lo, Seagrass-Struv-Med, and Seagrass-Struv-Hi (planted plots fertilized with
788 struvite). Letters designate significant differences between treatments for the same
789 sample dates. Points represent the mean of four replicates (\pm SE), except for above-
790 ground biomass, which had two to four replicates.

791

792





793

794 Figure 4. Clustering results of treatment methods from the second experiment. No

795 overlapping clusters were formed, indicating a significantly different global effect of

796 struvite onto the water chemistry and plant growth characteristics compared to

797 Osmocote™ treatment or control plot. Seagrass aboveground metrics (shoot count, blade

798 length and aboveground biomass) were heavily correlated ($r > 95\%$, $p < 0.001$) with first

799 principal component which explained 52.5% of the variance in the dataset. Porewater

800 nutrient dynamics such as TDN and TDP were most correlated ($p < 0.05$) and contributing

801 to second principal component which explained 32.4% of the variance in the dataset. The

802 treatments were labelled Seagrass (unfertilized seagrass plots), Seagrass-Osmo-Lo and

803 Seagrass-Osmo-Med (planted plots fertilized with Osmocote™), Seagrass-Struv-Lo,

804 Seagrass-Struv-Med, and Seagrass-Struv-Hi (planted plots fertilized with struvite).

805 Table S-1. Two-way linear mixed effects test results for shoot count and TDP from the
 806 single dose experiment/Experiment #1. Factors include treatment, date sampled, and
 807 the interaction between these factors.

Source	Variable					
	Shoot			TDP		
Parameter	DF	F statistic	P value	DF	F statistic	P value
Treatment	2	35.91	< 0.0001	5	246.7	< 0.0001
Date	7	10.07	< 0.0001	2	19.50	< 0.0001
Treatment x Date	14	27.95	< 0.0001	10	2.201	0.0328

808

809

810

811

812

813

814

815

816

817

818

819

820

821



822 Table S-2. Two-way linear mixed effects test results for seagrass metrics and
 823 porewater nutrients from the multi-dose experiment/Experiment #2. Factors include
 824 treatment, date sampled, and the interaction between these factors.

Source	Variable											
	Shoot			Length			TDN			TDP		
	-----count-----			-----cm-----			-----mg L ⁻¹ -----					
Parameter	DF	F statistic	P value	DF	F statistic	P value	DF	F statistic	P value	DF	F statistic	P value
Type	5	0.5703	0.7219	5	13.57	< 0.0001	8	22.37	< 0.0001	8	42.30	< 0.0001
Date	6	18.83	< 0.0001	3	83.75	< 0.0001	2	1.820	0.1686	3	128.2	< 0.0001
Type x Date	30	1.683	0.0289	15	2.118	0.0265	16	1.106	0.3636	24	6.341	< 0.0001

825

826 Table S-3. Linear mixed effects test table for biomass taken at the end of the multi-
 827 dose experiment/Experiment #2.

Variable						
Aboveground Biomass			Belowground Biomass			
Source	-----g-----					
Parameter	DF	F statistic	P value	DF	F statistic	P value
Type	4	5.231	0.0077	4	4.560	0.0131

828

829

830

831

832

833

834

835

836

837

838

839

840

841

842

843

844



845 Table S-4. Linear mixed effects test table for tissue nutrients (percent weight) taken at the end of the multi-dose
 846 experiment/Experiment #2.

Variable												
Aboveground %TN				Aboveground %TP			Belowground %TN			Belowground %TP		
Source	-----Percent-----											
Parameter	DF	F statistic	P value	DF	F statistic	P value	DF	F statistic	P value	DF	F statistic	P value
Type	4	0.784	0.560	3	0.583	0.639	4	3.072	0.049	4	0.539	0.709

847

848 Table S-5. Linear mixed effects test table for tissue nutrient mass (biomass x %
 849 nutrients) taken at the end of the multi-dose experiment/Experiment #2. Combined
 850 weights present the aboveground TN and TP weights were removed for the analysis (n=
 851 2 for Osmocote™ treatments, unfertilized seagrass removed). Belowground weights for
 852 both TN and TP did not have combined samples.

Variable												
Source												
-----g-----												
Parameter	DF	F statistic	P value	DF	F statistic	P value	DF	F statistic	P value	DF	F statistic	P value
Type	3	1.619	0.2370	3	2.524	0.1070	4	3.276	0.0406	4	3.705	0.0273

853
 854
 855
 856
 857
 858
 859
 860
 861
 862
 863
 864
 865
 866
 867
 868
 869
 870
 871
 872
 873
 874
 875
 876
 877
 878
 879

880 Table S-6. Mean sediment TC/TN values taken at the end of the multi-dose
 881 experiment/Experiment #2. The treatments were labelled control (unfertilized,
 882 unplanted plots), Osmo (unplanted fertilized with Osmocote), Struv (unplanted fertilized
 883 with struvite), S-Control (unfertilized seagrass plots), S-Osmo-Lo and S-Osmo-Med
 884 (planted plots fertilized with Osmocote), S-Struv-Lo, S-Struv-Med, and S-Struv-Hi
 885 (planted plots fertilized with struvite).

Treatment	Variable			
	TC		TN	
	Mean	SE	Mean	SE
	-----mg/kg-----			
Control	52.55 ^{NS}	2.22	2.058 ^{NS}	0.009
Control-Osmo	57.55 ^{NS}	2.24	2.073 ^{NS}	0.015
Control-Struv	53.53 ^{NS}	6.73	2.036 ^{NS}	0.016
Seagrass	52.09 ^{NS}	4.33	2.020 ^{NS}	0.032
Seagrass-Osmo-Lo	50.56 ^{NS}	3.28	2.0259 ^{NS}	0.005
Seagrass-Osmo-Med	49.46 ^{NS}	3.56	2.053 ^{NS}	0.027
Seagrass-Struv-Lo	52.02 ^{NS}	6.17	2.057 ^{NS}	0.027
Seagrass-Struv-Med	48.70 ^{NS}	5.02	2.023 ^{NS}	0.026
Seagrass-Struv-Hi	58.16 ^{NS}	5.63	2.096 ^{NS}	0.02

886

887

888

889

890

891

892

893

894

895

896

897

898

899

900

901

902



903 Table S-7. Mixed effects test table for sediment TC/TN taken at the end of the multi-
 904 dose experiment/Experiment #2.

Source	Variable					
	TC			TN		
Parameter	DF	F statistic	P value	DF	F statistic	P value
Treatment	8	0.5028	0.8435	8	1.376	0.2514

905

906

907

908

909

910

911

912

913

914

915

916

917

918

919

920

921

922

923

924 Table S-8. Mean porewater nutrient measurements from the second experiment. The
 925 treatments were labelled Control (unfertilized, unplanted plots), Control-Osmo
 926 (unplanted fertilized with Osmocote™), Control-Struv (unplanted fertilized with struvite),
 927 Seagrass (unfertilized seagrass plots), Seagrass-Osmo-Lo and Seagrass-Osmo-Med
 928 (planted plots fertilized with Osmocote™), Seagrass-Struv-Lo, Seagrass-Struv-Med,
 929 and Seagrass-Struv-Hi (planted plots fertilized with struvite). Only TDP was analyzed
 930 for Day 31, therefore TDN values at that date are designated “NA.” Letters within
 931 biomass type represent a significantly different mean based on linear mixed model
 932 analyses (NS= not significant).

Variable		TDN		TDP	
Days after Deployment	Treatment	Mean	SE	Mean	SE
		-----mg/L-----			
6	Control	1.51 ^{NS}	0.38	0.128 ^D	0.004
	Control-Osmo	12.03 ^{NS}	5.16	9.640 ^{AB}	3.685
	Control-Struv	4.35 ^{NS}	1.52	2.093 ^C	0.276
	Seagrass	1.41 ^{NS}	0.45	0.182 ^D	0.021
	Seagrass-Osmo-Lo	7.89 ^{NS}	4.34	4.750 ^{BC}	1.169
	Seagrass-Osmo-Med	26.8 ^{NS}	7.53	17.68 ^A	6.738
	Seagrass-Struv-Lo	4.33 ^{NS}	1.60	2.795 ^C	0.962
	Seagrass-Struv-Med	3.32 ^{NS}	0.88	1.943 ^C	0.211
	Seagrass-Struv-Hi	4.79 ^{NS}	0.86	2.620 ^C	0.351
20	Control	1.10 ^{NS}	0.16	0.133 ^C	0.010
	Control-Osmo	19.8 ^{NS}	2.14	0.508 ^A	0.102
	Control-Struv	5.59 ^{NS}	1.91	0.303 ^{ABC}	0.138
	Seagrass	0.78 ^{NS}	0.14	0.134 ^C	0.016
	Seagrass-Osmo-Lo	6.20 ^{NS}	2.33	0.289 ^{ABC}	0.094
	Seagrass-Osmo-Med	12.02 ^{NS}	0.82	0.472 ^{AB}	0.279
	Seagrass-Struv-Lo	2.47 ^{NS}	0.42	0.272 ^{ABC}	0.107
	Seagrass-Struv-Med	2.58 ^{NS}	0.80	0.187 ^{BC}	0.021
	Seagrass-Struv-Hi	6.81 ^{NS}	1.73	0.322 ^{ABC}	0.113

933

934 Table S-8. Continued.

		Variable			
Days after Deployment	Treatment	TDN		TDP	
		Mean	SE	Mean	SE
-----mg/L-----					
31	Control	NA	NA	0.110 ^D	0.009
	Control-Osmo	NA	NA	2.455 ^{BC}	0.560
	Control-Struv	NA	NA	2.923 ^{ABC}	0.966
	Seagrass	NA	NA	0.114 ^D	0.016
	Seagrass-Osmo-Lo	NA	NA	1.47 ^C	0.375
	Seagrass-Osmo-Med	NA	NA	9.733 ^{AB}	6.667
	Seagrass-Struv-Lo	NA	NA	0.163 ^D	0.038
	Seagrass-Struv-Med	NA	NA	1.353 ^C	0.166
74	Control	1.97 ^{NS}	0.19	0.085 ^C	0.007
	Control-Osmo	12.2 ^{NS}	7.54	0.488 ^A	0.135
	Control-Struv	7.75 ^{NS}	2.00	0.159 ^{BC}	0.054
	Seagrass	1.68 ^{NS}	0.15	0.084 ^C	0.021
	Seagrass-Osmo-Lo	5.39 ^{NS}	0.54	0.261 ^{AB}	0.067
	Seagrass-Osmo-Med	17.3 ^{NS}	4.98	0.551 ^A	0.105
	Seagrass-Struv-Lo	4.04 ^{NS}	1.23	0.162 ^{BC}	0.064
	Seagrass-Struv-Med	4.74 ^{NS}	1.03	0.143 ^{BC}	0.023
	Seagrass-Struv-Hi	9.32 ^{NS}	1.62	0.156 ^{BC}	0.017

935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954

955 Table S-9. Mean percent tissue nutrient content and ratio taken at the end of the
 956 second experiment. The treatments were labelled Seagrass (unfertilized seagrass
 957 plots), Seagrass-Osmo-Lo and Seagrass-Osmo-Med (planted plots fertilized with
 958 Osmocote™), Seagrass-Struv-Lo, Seagrass-Struv-Med, and Seagrass-Struv-Hi
 959 (planted plots fertilized with struvite). Combined weights present the aboveground TN
 960 and TP weights were removed for the analysis (n= 2 for Osmocote™ treatments,
 961 unfertilized seagrass removed). Belowground weights for both TN and TP did not have
 962 combined samples. Letters within biomass type represent a significantly different mean
 963 based on linear mixed model analyses (NS= not significant).

Biomass Type	Treatment	TN		TP		TN:TP	
		Mean	SE	Mean	SE	Mean	SE
		-----Percent-----				Wt/Wt Ratio	
Above-ground	Seagrass	1.90 ^{NS}	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Seagrass-Osmo-Lo	2.14 ^{NS}	0.11	0.258 ^{NS}	0.016	8.33 ^{NS}	0.57
	Seagrass-Osmo-Med	2.08 ^{NS}	0.11	0.249 ^{NS}	0.017	8.47 ^{NS}	0.88
	Seagrass-Struv-Lo	2.34 ^{NS}	0.23	0.236 ^{NS}	0.007	10.01 ^{NS}	1.20
	Seagrass-Struv-Med	2.31 ^{NS}	0.14	0.246 ^{NS}	0.010	9.38 ^{NS}	0.29
	Seagrass-Struv-Hi	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Below-ground	Seagrass	0.65 ^{AB}	0.06	0.166 ^{NS}	0.018	3.90 ^{NS}	0.36
	Seagrass-Osmo-Lo	0.53 ^B	0.07	0.154 ^{NS}	0.009	3.44 ^{NS}	0.47
	Seagrass-Osmo-Med	0.84 ^A	0.06	0.179 ^{NS}	0.008	4.71 ^{NS}	0.36
	Seagrass-Struv-Lo	0.66 ^{AB}	0.05	0.168 ^{NS}	0.011	3.94 ^{NS}	0.29
	Seagrass-Struv-Med	0.71 ^{AB}	0.07	0.164 ^{NS}	0.011	4.32 ^{NS}	0.45
	Seagrass-Struv-Hi	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

964
 965
 966
 967
 968
 969
 970



971
972 Figure S-1. Image showing an example of the differences in above and belowground
973 biomass in seagrasses from the first experiment. Observable stunted roots (possibly
974 root burn) are visible in the Osmocote™ treated plots (SP) versus the control (S) and
975 struvite treated plots (SS).

Declaration of interests

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

The authors declare the following financial interests/personal relationships which may be considered as potential competing interests:

Author Contributions

MacDonnell, C.: Conceptualization, data curation, formal analysis, methodology, visualization, project administration, investigation, roles/writing- original draft/review and editing.

Bydalek, F.: Conceptualization, data curation, formal analysis, investigation, resources, methodology, visualization, roles/writing- original draft/review and editing.

Osborne, T.: Conceptualization, data curation, formal analysis, supervision, resources, methodology, visualization, roles/writing- review and editing.

Beard, A.: Investigation, roles/writing- review and editing.

Barbour, S.: Investigation, resources, project administration.

Leonard, D.: Investigation, resources, project administration.

Makinia, J.: Resources, funding acquisition, writing- review and editing.

Inglett, P.W.: Conceptualization, supervision, data curation, project administration, formal analysis, methodology, visualization, roles/writing- original draft/review and editing.